THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For NOVEMBER, 1806.

Dum singuli pugnant, universi vincuntur!

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

The Life of John Milton. By Charles Symmons, D. D. of Jesus College, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. 566. 1805.

THIS work has been printed some time, but being intended to precede a new edition of the prose works of Milton, a delay of the publication of that work has also delayed the publication of this. In every Life yet written of our great epic poet, his political conduct always makes the most prominent feature; and, indeed, it can hardly be otherwise. The secret workings of the imagination of the poet are only seen in their productions; but the author, whose pen is employed in political controversy, must take some part in the scenes he is engaged in describing and defending, and, in consequence of this, his actions will sometimes be brought forward with his writings.

Besides the partiality a biographer feels for the person whose life he is writing, and for that particular part of his actions to which that life particularly relates, Dr. Symmons is an avowed advocate for that cause in which the pen of Milton was engaged. To avoid any charge of misrepresentation, we will quote what he himself says on this subject.

"For the political sentiments discoverable in my work I am neither inclined, nor, indeed, able to offer an apology. They flow directly from those principles which I imbibed with my first efforts of reflection, which have derived force from my subsequent reading and observation, which have 'grown with my growth, and strengthened with my strength."—

If they should, therefore, unhappily be erroneous, my misfortune, as I fear, is hopelessly irremediable, for they are now so vitally blended with my thought and my feelings, that with them they must exist or must perish. The nature of these principles will be obviously and immediately apparent to my readers; for I have made too explicit an avowal of my political creed, with reference to the civil and the ecclesiastical system, of which I am fortunately a member, to be under any apprehensions of suffering by misconstruction. If any man should affect to see more deeply into my bosom than I profess to see myself; or to detect an ambush of mischief which I have been studious to cover from observation—that man will be the object, not of my resentment but, of my pity. I shall be assured that he suffers the infliction of a perverted head or a corrupt heart, and to that I shall contentedly resign him after expressing a simple perhaps, but certainly a sincere wish for his relief from what may justly be considered as the severest of human evils."

Of this political creed of the Doctor we can only say, that though it is not exactly ours, we do not profess intuitively to know more of him than he professes to know of himself; but yet, if in the course of our examination of his work, certain symptoms of his carrying his political sentiments much further, should discover themselves by manifest token, we hope we shall not incur the censure of being inflicted with a perverted or a corrupt heart, for seeing what it is impossible *not* to see.

The first paragraph of the work is what we should have hardly expected to find in the production of a man of Dr. Symmons's known taste and genius.

"The author of the 'Defence of the People of England,' and of the 'Paradise Lost,' has engaged too much of the attention of his species not to invite their curiosity to the circumstances of his life, and the peculiarities of his character."

Is it possible that any man of genius could name the Defence of the People of England, and the Paradise Lost, in the same sentence?

Mrs. Macaulay, of republican memory, used to say, that she thought little of Milton the songster, but Milton the patriot she adored. From a man like Dr. Symmons, however strong his political prejudices may be, we should expect an opinion directly the reverse, and we should deprecate the public pursuits which drew aside the author of such charming poems as the Comus, the Lycidas, L'Allegro, and Il Penseroso, for twenty years from his poetical studies, and overwhelmed his mind in seditious controversy: or, to use the elegant and emphatical words of his present biographer *(O si omnia sic)*, we must lament, that "*the baleful fury of politics diverted his fancy from where she*—

"Roll'd o'er Elysian flowers her amber stream,
Into a channel polluted with weeds, and horrid with precipices."

Returning again to the political opinion of our biographer, we select

lect the passage relative to the death of the unfortunate King. The army, he says:

"Having possessed themselves of the Parliament by force, they once more seize upon the Monarch, and, insulting him with the mockery of a legal trial, under the pretended authority of an unrepresented people, they lead him to suffer on the scaffold. In pronouncing the illegality of this whole proceeding, the voice of the dispassionate and the intelligent must necessarily be unanimous; *and the question will not be found to include any part of that respecting the guilt of Charles, or the right of the nation to make him responsible, with his life, for the abuse of his delegated sceptre.* He fell, as it must be obvious, not by the judicial, but by the military sword; and, though Bradshaw pronounced the sentence, the fanatic army, under the guidance of Ireton and Cromwell, were in truth the authors of his death."

The passage in italics avows the right of the people to put a monarch to death for the abuse, and consequently perhaps for the imagined abuse of his delegated power. That the power of an hereditary monarch can not be said to have been delegated by the people is obvious; nevertheless, loyal as we profess to be to one of the best of Sovereigns, we cannot admit that a King may invade those rights, which it is his duty to defend, without resistance; yet we can never assent to the notion, that when the irresponsibility of the King is one of the fundamental parts of the constitution, it can be justifiable for any tribunal, however constituted, to inflict punishment on him. Such a doctrine might suit the regicides of England in the seventeenth, and the regicides of France in the eighteenth century; but if the misguided son of Charles, who was infinitely more culpable than his father, for in addition to his political errors, he tried to overturn the religion of his country, and substitute Papacy in its stead, had fallen into the power of his opposers, instead of escaping to France, does it enter into the head of any the most determined Whig in the country, that the Houses of Parliament, who voted the throne vacant, in the latter case which *did* happen, would have proceeded to try him, and punish him in the former case, supposing it *had* happened? We shall have occasion to say more on this subject as we proceed.

The following eulogium on Cromwell, from the pen of Milton, is almost equal in adulation to the praises lavished on Buonaparte by the literary sycophants of France; nor is it any excuse, that it was done with a view to induce him to establish a Republic. Had Hambden petitioned Charles to abandon the levy of ship-money in such abject terms, what would the historian have said of him? but we shall see presently the favourable distinction made by the pseudo patriots of the present day with regard to usurpers, when compared with lawful princes.

"Proceed then, O Cromwell! and exhibit, under every circumstance, the same loftiness of mind: for it becomes you, and is consistent with your greatness. The *redeemer*, as you are, of your country, the author, the guardian, the preserver of her liberty, you can assume no additional

character more important or more august: since not only the actions of our kings, but the fabled exploits of our heroes are overcome by your achievements."

We had at first reading styled this *blasphemous* adulation, but on turning to the original Latin we found the very improper word, to say the least of it, that we have marked by italics, is not Milton's; his words are—*patriæ liberator*.

As a striking proof of the distinction we have just noticed, we cite Dr. Symmons's observation on the Restoration, and the means by which it was effected.

"On this last excess of the army" (that is, their expulsion of that remnant of the Long Parliament, commonly called in derision the Rump), "under the influence of men, destitute alike of ability and of public feeling, and equally incapable of providing for their own interests, or for those of the community, the nation experienced a species of anarchy, and fell into the extreme of degradation under a military despotism. The Presbyterians, discontented since the triumph of the Independents, but crushed beneath the weighty sceptre of Oliver, and acquiescing in the succession of his son, now openly avowed their disaffection to the ruling powers, and united themselves heartily with the Royalists.

"This extraordinary confusion and conflict of parties opened a field to Monk, who had been placed by Cromwell at the head of the forces in Scotland, and was now the governor of that kingdom, for the display of his inconstancy, his cunning, and his perfidy. Peculiarly favoured by his situation, and solicited by the Presbyterians, the people, and the Parliament, for aid against an insolent soldiery, who, like the blind giant of classical fable, possessed brutal power without the vision requisite to divert it from self-destroying exertion, this wavering and narrow-minded man, with mean talents but with deep dissimulation, was enabled to betray all who confided in him, to abandon his old associates to the butchery of legal vengeance, and, with a fearful accumulation of perjury on his head, to surrender the nation, without a single stipulation in its favour, to the dominion of a master, in whom voluptuousness and cruelty were confounded in a disgusting embrace. By every intelligent and reflecting man, the restoration of the monarchy of England must be hailed as a most auspicious event: but it may be questioned, whether the unconditional restoration of it, and this alone was properly the act of Monk, can be regarded as a benefit either to the Prince, or to the people; to the former, whom it allured to those excesses which induced the final expulsion of his family from the throne; to the latter, whom it immediately exposed to the evils of an injurious reign, and eventually subjected to the necessity of asserting, with the blood of two domestic wars, their right to civil and religious liberty."

Monk is a character never to be forgiven by republicans, for his restoring the King and the legitimate Government of the country; he was the only man who had it in his power to save the metropolis and the kingdom from the worst of tyrannies—that of a licentious army; and the only means he had to effect this salutary purpose, have always

always been branded, by the disappointed votaries of democracy, as inconstancy, cunning and perfidy. What is the whole system of warfare but a continued violation of the duties of civil life? but shall it be called murder to push the bayonet at the breast of the invader, or treachery to circumvent his scheme by feigned attacks in one place, while real ones are made in another? We must agree with the poet, that—

"———————— necessary means
For good or noble ends can ne'er belong."

Had Monk used those means for the establishment of a republic, instead of for the restoration of the King, we should have found no stigma on his character here, notwithstanding the concluding part of the quotation.

We give another proof of the author's predilection for usurped government. While he is excused, and even applauded, for accepting the office of Latin Secretary under Cromwell, let us mark what is said of his refusal of it under Charles II.

"When an offer was made to him, soon after his marriage, of a restitution of his official situation, she" (his third wife), "is said to have pressed, with much earnest and troublesome importunity, his acceptance of the proffered benefit. But to be in office under the new government, and under Charles, whom he saw polluted with the blood of his friends, was abhorrent from all his principles and his feelings, and he silenced the solicitations of the lady with, 'You are in the right: you as other women, would ride in your coach: my aim is to live and die an honest man.'"

The offer of this office to Milton, which Dr. Symmons says rests upon authority which seems to be decisive, completely refutes the malignant insinuation against Charles II. in the following passage:

"As a story, which I have seen in print (but by whom told, or on what authority, I know not), is in perfect harmony with the point and spirit of these verses, it shall be inserted for the amusement of my readers. It bears some internal marks of authenticity, and exhibits very justly the *the gay and the gloomy malignity* of the two Royal Brothers, Charles and James.

"The Duke of York, as it is reported, expressed one day to the King his brother, a great desire to see old Milton, of whom he had heard so much. The King replied, that he felt no objection to the Duke's satisfying his curiosity: and accordingly, soon afterwards James went privately to Milton's house, where, after an introduction, which explained to the old republican the rank of his guest, a free conversation ensued between these very dissimilar and discordant characters. In the course, however, of the conversation, the Duke asked Milton whether he did not regard the loss of his eye-sight as a judgment inflicted on him for what he had written against the late King? Milton's reply was to this effect:—'If your Highness thinks that the calamities which befall us here are indications of the wrath of heaven, in what manner are we to account for the fate of the King, your father? The displeasure of heaven must, upon

this supposition, have been much greater against him than against me—for I have lost only my eyes, but he lost his head.'

"Much discomposed by this answer, the Duke soon took his leave and went away. On his return to Court, the first words which he spoke to the King were—'Brother, you are greatly to blame that you don't have that old rogue Milton hanged.'—'Why, what is the matter, James?' said the King, 'you seem in a heat. What, have you seen Milton?'—'Yes,' answered the Duke, I have seen him.'—'Well,' said the King, 'in what condition did you find him?'—'Condition, why he is old and very poor.'—'Old and poor! Well, and he is blind too—is he not?'—'Yes, blind as a beetle.'—'Why then,' observed the King, 'you are a fool, James, to have him hanged as a punishment: to hang him will be doing him a service; it will be taking him out of his miseries. No—if he is old, poor, and blind, he is miserable enough; in all conscience let him live!'"

No man not warped by the grossest prejudices against a Monarch, and monarchy, could have seen any thing in this reply of the careless and good-humoured King, but a sarcasm on the gloomy and malicious temper of his brother.

We shall turn with pleasure from the remarks on the prose writings of Milton, where a strong spirit of republican is apparent throughout the whole, notwithstanding a few saving clauses scattered here and there with a sparing hand, that the work might not be too offensive to the generality of its readers (for we believe the number of democrats is diminishing every day), to contemplate the man of taste and genius in the remarks on the poetry of Milton.

With the sentiments of Dr. Symmons on the Paradise Regained, we perfectly agree.

"On the fate of the Paradise Regained" (he says) "the voice of the public, which on a question of poetic excellence cannot for any long time be erroneous, has irrevocably decided. Not to object to the impropriety of the title, which would certainly be more consistent with a work on the death and the resurrection of our Blessed Lord, the extreme narrowness of the plan of the poem, the small proportion of it which is assigned to action, and the large part which is given to disputations and didactic dialogue, its paucity of characters and of poetic imagery; and, lastly, its general deficiency in the charm of numbers, must for ever preclude it from any extended range of popularity. It may be liked and applauded by those who are resolute to like, and are hardy to applaud: but to the great body of the readers of poetry, let the critics amuse themselves with their exertions as they please, it will always be 'caviare.' It is embellished, however, with several exquisite passages, and it certainly shows in some of its finer parts, the still existing author of the Paradise Lost."

Nor are his remarks on the Sampson Agonistes less just.

"On the merits of the 'Sampson Agonistes,' there has fortunately been no important contrariety of opinion. By the universal suffrage it has been pronounced a manly, noble, and pathetic drama, the progeny of a mind

a mind equally exalted, sensitive and poetic. Its delineation of character, though not various, is discriminate and true; its sentiments are uniformly weighty and dignified; its diction is severe, exquisite, and sublime; and over the whole is thrown an awful and majestic gloom, which subdues at the same time that it elevates the imagination.

"With reference, however, either to its conduct or to its execution, it cannot be considered as a faultless piece. On the subject of its conduct, I must concur with Dr. Johnson in thinking, that it is destitute of a just poetic middle; that the action of the drama is suspended during some of its intermediate scenes, which might be amputated without any injury to the fable. In the inferior department of execution, the author seems to have been betrayed into error by his desire of imitating the choral measures of the Greeks. He perceived that the masters of the Grecian theatre united in their chorusses verses of all descriptions, either without any rule, or without any which modern critics had been able to ascertain; and his fine ear could not be insensible to the harmonious consequence of this apparently capricious association. He was, hence, unwarily induced to imagine that a like arbitrary junction of verses in his own language would be productive of nearly a like effect; and without, perhaps, reflecting on the rich variety of the Greek metres, or on the genius of the English language, and the habits of the English ear, he threw together, in the choral parts of his drama, a disorderly rabble of lines of all lengths, some of which are destitute of rhythm, and the rest modifications only of the iambic. The result, as might be expected, has been far from happy; and the chorus, instead of giving to his piece the charm of varied harmony, has injured and deformed it with jarring and broken numbers."

We do not think this volume improved by the translation of Milton's Latin Poems. The merit of modern Latin verse consists chiefly in happy allusions to, and application of, phrases used by the classic writers, every vestige of which must be lost in a translation.

We must think the biographers of Milton take too much pains to disprove the story of his corporal punishment at Cambridge, since we know from the existing statutes that such punishments were formerly in use at our universities. When (for we suppose that time will come), such punishments shall cease, at least with respect to the larger boys at our public schools, would it be any disgrace to the memory either of Mr. Pitt or Mr. Fox, if it could be proved they were both flogged at Eton?

We cannot take leave of this work without lamenting the family misfortunes that afflicted the author during the time he was engaged in it. The loss of a daughter, who could have written this sonnet, when only in the middle of her twelfth year, was a trial of no common severity.

"ON A BLIGHTED ROSE-BUD.

"Scarce had thy velvet lips imbibed the dew,
And Nature hail'd thee infant queen of May;
Scarce saw thy opening bloom the sun's broad ray,
And to the air its tender fragrance threw,

When the north wind enamour'd of thee grew;
And by his cold, rude kiss thy charms decay:
Now droops thy head, now fades thy blushing hue—
No more the queen of flowers, no longer gay.
So blooms a maid, her guardians—health and joy—
Her mind array'd in innocency's vest—
When suddenly, impatient to destroy,
Death clasps the virgin to his iron breast.
She fades—the parent, sister, friend, deplore
The charms and budding virtues now no more!

Nov. 27, 1800. CAROLINE SYMMONS.

An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England, which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical. In Eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1804, *at the Lectures founded by J. Bampton, M. A. Canon of Salisbury.* By Richard Laurence, LL.D. of University College. 8vo. Pp. 460. Hanwell and Parker, Oxford; and Rivingtons, &c. London, 1805.

OF all the lectures founded by pious individuals, for the support and illustration of the Christian faith, and which have rendered such essential service to the Church of England, that of Mr. Bampton, as it is on the most comprehensive plan, is perhaps the most useful.—Others have furnished very complete confutations of Atheism and Deism, of Arianism and Socinianism; but they are, each, more or less confined, by the will of the founder, to the discussion of some particular subject. The Bampton Lecturer may take a wider range. Whatever is connected with the Christian religion, the history of the church in general, the doctrine, discipline, and constitution of our own church in particular: even the rules of reasoning, and the laws of human belief, fall within his plan. Hence it is, that these lectures may not only furnish antidotes to the varied poison of infidelity, as it is daily administered, but also prove a source of theological information to the student, ambitious of fitting himself for the sacred office of feeding the flock of Christ. Other lectures have been founded for the purposes of confirming and establishing the Christian faith, illustrating prophecy, and proving the divinity of our Lord and Saviour, and the divinity of the Holy Ghost; but the Bampton lectures, while they embrace every one of these objects, comprehend likewise another of great importance—the confutation of all heretics and schismatics, who by their writings controvert the faith, and by their practices disturb the peace of the church.

The faith has been long assaulted, though assaulted in vain, by the disciples of Socinus; and the illiterate vulgar have been long led astray by the *ignis fatuus* of itinerant methodism; but of late years the most rancorous dissentions have been excited within the bosom of the church

church herself, by those who arrogate to themselves exclusively the appellation of *evangelical preachers.* The schisms excited by these men are infinitely more hurtful to the peace of society, and more directly contrary to the genuine spirit of Christianity, than the open separation of those, who, dissenting from the established faith, or disapproving of the established hierarchy, withdraw themselves from the communion of the Church of England, and form, as they think, more apostolical churches for themselves. With the conscientious Dissenter, however erroneous his faith may be, or however novel the constitution of his conventicle, the conscientious Churchman may live certainly in the bond of peace, if not in the unity of the spirit; but it seems to be impossible to live even in *peace* with that clergyman of the church, who represents nine-tenths of his brethren as heretics and perjured knaves; and who embraces every opportunity, which his situation affords him, of intruding into his brother's pulpit, and alienating from him the affections and regard of those simple and unlearned Christians who are committed to his pastoral care, and are unable to judge of the conformity of his doctrine with that which the church enjoins him to teach. That such are the practices of that small number of clergymen, who, interpreting the thirty-nine articles of religion in a Calvinistic sense, denominate themselves the only *true Churchmen*, is a fact too notorious to be called in question. Every Anti-Calvinist is by them loaded with the most opprobrious epithets, because he does not understand three or four articles on the most abstruse questions in Christianity exactly as they understand them; because he does not think it necessary, or even expedient, to agitate such questions in sermons preached to a mixed audience; and because he labours to prove that repentance and good works, as well as faith, are conditions of final justification.

The question between these contending brethren is not, at least in the first instance, what is the sense of *Scripture* on the controverted points, but what is the sense of the *Articles*, which both have willingly and *ex animo* subscribed in the literal and grammatical sense of each article.—"Much," (as Dr. Laurence observes) "has been written, and satisfactorily written, to prove that the Predestinarian system of Calvin is totally inconsistent with our Articles; that it is equally irreconcileable with our liturgy and homilies; and that the private sentiments of our Reformers were likewise inimical to it."—The labours of the Bishop of Lincoln, of Dr. Kipling, Mr. Daubeny, Archdeacon Pott, Mr. Pearson, and, may we not add, of ourselves and our fellow-labourers the British Critics, in this righteous cause, seem indeed, in the opinion of the more learned and judicious part of the public, to have been crowned with complete success.

"But" (continues Dr. Laurence) "complete in all points as such evidence may appear (the force of which its opponents have been unable to invalidate), the author, still convinced that an elucidation of another kind was wanting; that the weight of testimony might be augmented by an attempt to trace the Articles, usually controverted on the occasion, up to their genuine sources, to compare them with the peculiar opinions of

their

their own times, and thus to determine their meaning with more certainty, by ascertaining the precise objects which their compilers had in view."

It is, indeed, only by ascertaining the precise objects which any English writer of a former age had in view, that his meaning on controverted points can be determined with certainty; for of every living language the words are continually, though slowly, varying their meaning; and that which signified one thing 200 years ago, may now be employed to denote something in various respects different. This is remarkably the case with respect to the language of our Articles. Of the controversies which were agitated among the Reformers themselves, as well as between the Reformers and the Church of Rome, some are now forgotten; whilst there are other controversies afloat at present, of which the Reformers could have no notion. The language, however, of the Articles remains unchanged; and such as imagine that their compilers intended them to express the sentiments of the Church of England on *every* topic in theology that could occur, even to the end of the world, must necessarily interpret some of them, so as to embrace opinions, of which Cranmer and his associates never dreamed; whilst, by overlooking the circumstances under which they were drawn up, they lose sight of the only sense in which they were, by the Reformers, intended to be subscribed. Our author, adverting to this circumstance, observes, in his first sermon, that—

"In discussing with impartiality questions of a remote æra, it is requisite, but not easy, to discard modern prepossessions; to place ourselves exactly in the situation, and under the circumstances of those, whose sentiments we wish to investigate, and display with fidelity. On such occasions we are usually too much disposed to throw in light, where we perceive only an indistinct mass of shade, or at least to revive that, which in our eyes appears faint and faded, endeavouring in every instance to improve according to our own taste and fancy, instead of faithfully exhibiting the simpler productions of antiquity. But the subject before me is attended with another difficulty. From its peculiar nature it is confined to disquisitions, which, having lost at this distant period their immediate importance, and ceased to interest us, it seems almost impossible again to bring forward, without fatiguing the attention, and appearing to clog the argument with much heavy detail, and which can seldom afford an opportunity for the diffusion of ornament, for popular dissertation, or for elegant composition."

In language, however, which is sufficiently elegant, our author proves in this sermon, which is preached from 2 Tim. iii. 14, that our Articles, far from being framed according to the system of Calvin, were modelled after the Lutheran system, in opposition to the Romish tenets of the day; that our Reformation was a progressive work, commenced in the reign of Henry VIII. and completed in all its essential parts under his successor; that both these Princes repeatedly solicited *Melancthon* to come over to England and lend his powerful aid

to

to Cranmer and others, who conducted the Reformation; that the two publications entitled the *Bishop's Book*, and the *King's Book*, which were avowedly systems of faith, breathe the spirit of Lutheranism; that relative to the points in controversy between the English Calvinists, and the majority of the established Clergy, there is little, if any thing to be found in either of them, which is materially different from what was subsequently established; and that not only the sentiments, but many of the very expressions which are transferred from these books to some of our existing Articles, have been evidently derived from the Confession of Augsburgh. In the course of the discussion Dr. Laurence vindicates Cranmer from some censures passed on his talents and character by Burnet and others; convicts Burnet himself of unpardonable negligence, to give it no harsher name, in his celebrated History of the English Reformation; and detects a mistake of some importance into which the laborious, and generally accurate historian Collier has fallen. He then observes, that—

"Our first Reformers, had they been so disposed, might have turned their attention to the novel establishment at Geneva, which Calvin had just succeeded in forming according to his wishes; might have imitated its singular institutions, and inculcated its peculiar doctrines; but this they declined, viewing it, perhaps, as a faint luminary (for as such only could it then have been contemplated), scarcely in the horizon of its celebrity. This they might have done; but they rather chose to give reputation to their opinions, and stability to their system, by adopting, where reason permitted, Lutheran sentiments, and expressing themselves in Lutheran language. Yet slavishly attached to no particular tenets, although revering those which were held universally sacred, and submissive to no man's dictates, they felt a conscious pride in reasoning for themselves; anxious only to prove all things according to that talent which God had given them, by the test of truth, and the unerring standard of Holy Scripture." (P. 24.)

In the second sermon, from Jeremiah iii. 15, Dr. Laurence pursues the same subject; proving, by incontrovertible evidence, that our Reformation was coolly and deliberately conducted; that years were spent in bringing the National Creed to a state of perfection; that, in the reign of Edward VI. Cranmer took no step of importance without consulting Melancthon, then alone at the head of the Lutheran Church; that those two eminent Divines projected a general Council of Protestants to be held in England for the compilation of a formulary of faith for the use of the whole Protestant Church; that Calvin applauded that measure; but that when it was dropt, he found fault with Cranmer for not settling the faith of the Church of England more quickly. To express his opinion of the proposed Council, which he offered to attend, and to blame the *deliberate* proceedings of the English Primate, seems indeed to be all that he did (for he was *requested* to do nothing) in the work of our Reformation, whilst Melancthon was continually pressing upon the congenial spirit of the Archbishop the necessity of *moderation*, and cautioning him against the

those *stoical doctrines* which had disgraced other reformed churches*. Accordingly it appears, that whatever was borrowed by Cranmer from foreign churches, was borrowed from the Lutherans; and that Parker, who succeeded him in this great work, trod closely in his footsteps.

"When a permanent system of faith was settled by the Clergy assembled in convocation under Elizabeth, the see of Canterbury was filled by Archbishop Parker, who, as an antiquarian and Saxon scholar, still ranks high in the republic of letters. Nor, as the restorer of our church, did he acquire a less solid, if less brilliant, reputation. Called by the providence of God to rebuild the walls of our Zion, rudely subverted by Papal bigotry, he neglected not the revered materials of the former fabric. After the revival of our Liturgy, his attention was directed to the consideration of speculative questions: and here the temperate proceedings of the assembly which discussed them, seemed perfectly to correspond with his most sanguine wishes. Instead of entering upon the task of innovation, instead of bringing forward a new code of doctrines, which some might have thought more adapted to the improved state of religious taste and sentiment, the Convocation was satisfied to tread in a beaten path; it not only made the articles of Cranmer the basis of the proposed system, but adopted them, in general, word for word. Of what was the intention in this respect, no testimony can be more conclusive, than the evidence of the original document itself, which is still preserved, with the signatures of the Clergy annexed to it, and which is nothing more than an interlined and amended copy of the formulary, which had been adopted in the preceding reign†.

"Whatsoever then might have been the dispositions of a few over zealous men, the members of this important convention displayed a remarkable proof of their moderation and judgment, by generally reviving what had been before established, rather than, in order to gratify the restless spirit of innovation, by inculcating novel doctrines. Instead of increasing the number of the Articles‡, they diminished them; instead of extending their sense, so as to make them embrace a greater proportion of speculative tenets, they contracted them, and appeared in every case more disposed to extinguish difference of opinion, than to augment it by adding fuel to a flame, already rising above controul. In one or two instances indeed additions, or rather additional elucidations, were admitted. Of the tendency however of these we cannot doubt, when we learn, that, with the exception of one obvious topic alone, they were not original; that they were neither the productions of Parker nor the Convocation;

---

* "Illud autem te oro, ut deliberes cum viris bonis, ac vere doctis, et quod statuendum et *qua moderatione initio in dicendo opus sit. ..... Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes apud nostros de fato, et disciplinæ nocuerunt. Quare te rogo, ut de tali aliqua formula doctrinæ cogites.*"—See our Author's Notes at the end of the volume, p. 223.

† Dr. Laurence evidently means in the reign of Edward. The reign immediately preceding Elizabeth's was the reign of Mary.—Rev.

‡ The original Articles were in number forty-two.

and

and that they were not borrowed from any Calvinistical or Zuinglian, but from a Lutheran Creed. The Creed to which I allude, is the Confession of Wirtembergh, which was exhibited in the Council of Trent the very year, when our own Articles were completely arranged by Cranmer. That their resemblance to this composition should have been hitherto overlooked is the more remarkable, because it seems too visible, one would conceive, to have escaped the notice of the most superficial observer. For it was not confined to a mere affinity of idea, or the occasional adoption of an individual expression; but in some cases entire extracts were copied, without the slightest omission or minutest variation." (Pp. 40-42.)

Dr. Laurence does not expect his reader to admit these assertions on his bare authority, but furnishes him, in the notes, with an opportunity of convincing himself. By collating the Augsburgh and Wirtembergh Confessions with the English, he proves, beyond the reach of controversy, that from these two Lutheran Confessions are derived our First, Second, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Sixteenth, Twentieth, Twenty-fifth, Twenty-sixth, Thirty-first, and Thirty-fourth, Articles; and it is the object of the six subsequent Sermons to prove, that there is no one of our Articles that harmonizes with the system of Calvin.

"To the writings of Calvin it will be in vain to apply, as some have done, from any conception that our Clergy, in the last revision, were eager to propagate the new principles, which they may be supposed to have imbibed during the sanguinary persecution of Mary. For, as if distrustful upon this head, the prudent restorers of our church, unless on an individual question, where the interests of truth forbad a compromise, kept the creed of a different communion in view; the creed likewise of an æra prior to that event, which, by compelling many of our proscribed countrymen to take refuge on the Continent, particularly at Geneva, laid the foundation of a controversy respecting discipline and the forms of divine worship, which long disturbed the tranquillity of our ecclesiastical establishment, often threatened its existence, and once actually subverted it. But to the name of Calvin, whose talents even prejudice must confess to have been not inferior to his piety, but whose love of hypothesis was perhaps superior to both, from the celebrity which it afterwards acquired, too much importance has been sometimes annexed. It has been forgotten, that at the time under contemplation, the errors of the church of Rome were almost the sole objects of religious altercation, no public dissention of consequence having occurred among Protestants, although thinking variously on various topics, except upon the single point of the Eucharist. * * * * *

"His (Calvin's) theory of predestination, at the period under review, had not passed the controversial flame, from which, in the estimation of his zealous adherents, it came forth with additional brilliancy and purity. It was not then, as afterwards, the object of applause, but, on the contrary, of disapprobation*. For his doctrine of *God's dreadful decree*, which

* In a long note, our author proves from the most authentic documents, that in the year 1552, when our Articles were compiled, the Calvinistic

which before had attracted little notice, was then beginning to give offence both within and without the territory of Geneva. *Dreadful* I term it, as being

---

vinistic controversy, as it has since been generally termed, was only commencing; that then Calvin published his first work professedly on the subject; and that even so late as the year 1555, a combination, or, as Beza calls it, a faction, of some neighbouring ministers, was formed against him. Perhaps the following view of election, as it is given in the first Confession of the Reformed Church of Scotland, may be deemed a sufficient proof that even KNOX, the author of that Confession, had not, in the year 1560, adopted the blasphemous notions of Calvin respecting election and reprobation. Of the Twenty-five Articles of which that Confession consists, it is the Eighth, and entitled

"OF ELECTION.

"That same eternal God, who, of mere grace, elected us in Christ Jesus his Son, before the foundation of the world was laid, appointed him (Christ Jesus) to be our Head, our Brother, our Pastor, and great Bishop of our souls: but because that the enmity betwixt the justice of God and our sins was such, that no flesh by itself could or might have returned unto God, it behoved that the Son should descend unto us, and take himself a body of our body, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, and so become the perfect Mediator betwixt God and man; giving power to so many as believe in him to be the sons of God, as he himself doth witness; *I pass up to my Father and your Father, to my God and unto your God:* by which most holy fraternity, whatsoever we have lost in Adam is restored to us again; and for this cause we are nothing afraid to call God our Father, not so much in that he hath created us (which we have common with the reprobate), as for that, that he hath given to us his only Son to be our Brother, and given unto us grace to embrace him for our only Mediator, as before is said. It behoved further the Messiah and Redeemer to be very God and very man, because he was to suffer the punishment due for our transgressions, and to present himself in the presence of his Father's judgment, as in our person, to suffer for our transgression and disobedience, by death to overcome sin that was the author of death. But because the only Godhead could not suffer death, neither could only the manhood overcome the same, he joined both together in one person, that the imbecility of the one should suffer, and be subject to death (which we had deserved), and the infinite and invincible power of the other, viz. of the Godhead, should triumph, and purchase unto us life, liberty, and perpetual victory; and so we confess, and most undoubtedly believe."—*Knox's History*, Edit. 1790, p. 234.

This view of election is widely different from that of Calvin, which was first imported into Scotland, in 1575, by Andrew Melville, and is now incorporated with the established creed. Yet Knox was no stranger to the Calvinistic system, had a great respect for its author, and approved the novel constitution which he had given to the Church of Geneva; but being at Geneva in the year 1555, he had probably joined the faction of neighbouring Ministers, who, as Beza admits, then opposed the doctrine

of

being no less so to his feelings, than to ours; for the same strong epithet he himself applied to it. 'Horribile quidem decretum fateor,' were the precise expressions which he used, when shuddering at his own favourite idea of irrespective reprobation.

"To the labours therefore of the Lutherans I shall turn in preference. But, before I enter upon the task, it seems necessary to state, that some discrimination will be exercised; that, rejecting such opinions as they themselves abandoned about the æra of the diet of Augsburgh, I shall bring forward only those, which were subsequently established in their stead. For it ought not to be concealed, that previously to the time when Lutheranism first became settled upon a permanent basis, and added public esteem to public notice, tenets were advanced, which retarded the progress of truth more than all the subtleties of scholastical argument, or the terrors of papal anathema. At the beginning of the Reformation, as Melancthon frankly observed to Cranmer in a correspondence already alluded to, there existed among its advocates stoical disputations respecting fate, offensive in their nature, and noxious in their tendency. The duration, however, of these stoical disputations, it should be remarked, was but short; and the substitution of a more rational as well as practical system, for the space of more than twenty years before the appearance of our Articles, prevented the founder of our church from mistaking for the doctrines of the Lutherans, those which they themselves wished to forget, and were anxious to obliterate."

Dr. Laurence having thus traced our Articles to the sources from which they were derived, proceeds to inquire into the sentiments of the Lutheran reformers on the subjects of those Articles which the Calvinists claim for their own. His Third Sermon, on Romans, v. 19, is devoted to the Article on original sin; and as we shall make several remarks on this doctrine, it will be necessary to make rather copious extracts from the Sermon, that we may not be accused of misrepresenting the view which our author gives of the opinions either of the reformers, or of their opponents. Having animadverted on the scholastic doctrine of *merit*, as at once repugnant to reason, and subversive of Scripture, and therefore peculiarly and justly obnoxious to the reformers, Dr. Laurence observes, that

"Upon original sin, the subject of our present consideration, their doctrine was no less fanciful, and remote from every scriptural idea, than flattering to human pride. This they assumed as the ground-work of a system, which wholly concealed from view what they professed to enshrine, the glory of the Lord, the bright manifestation of Deity displayed in the gospel covenant. They contended, that the infection of our nature is not a mental, but a mere corporeal taint; that the body alone receives and transmits the contagion, while the soul in all instances proceeds immaculate from the hands of her Creator. This disposition to dis-

---

of unconditional election and reprobation. This is the more probable, that he had visited the Lutheran churches in Germany, and was for some time one of the pastors of the English refugees at Frankfort.—Rev.

ease,

ease, such as they allowed it to be, was considered by some of them as the effect of a peculiar quality in the forbidden fruit; by others, as having been contracted from the poisonous breath of the infernal spirit, which inhabited the serpent's body." (P. 56.)

This last opinion is indeed fanciful, and probably peculiar to the Scholastics; but the former has been maintained by some very eminent divines of our own Church, with a plausibility of argument which those who admit the positive infection of human nature, will not find it an easy task completely to overturn *. If the infection be derived by generation from Adam, we apprehend that it *must* be confined *directly* to the body, and communicated from it only *indirectly* to the soul, unless the soul, as well as the body, be *extraduce*, as Tertullian, and a few other fathers, taught. But if the soul be *extraduce*, must we not conceive it to be *material*, or, in other words, extended and solid; to grow with the body, to decay with the body, and with the body to die? These consequences, which seem utterly inconsistent with all that we know of the soul, as well by reason as by revelation, too plainly follow from the hypothesis, that we derive from Adam

* "We know," says Dr. Delany, "there are several fruits, in several parts of the world, of so noxious a nature, as to destroy the best human constitution upon earth. We also know very well, that there are some fruits in the world which inflame the blood into fevers and phrenzies. And we are told, that the *Indians* are acquainted with a certain juice, which immediately turns the person who drinks it into an idiot; leaving him at the same time in the enjoyment of his health, and all the powers of his body. Now I ask, whether it is not possible, nay, whether it is not rational, to believe, that the same fruit which, in the present infirmity of nature, would utterly destroy the human constitution, might, in the highest perfection we can imagine it, at least disturb, and impair, and disease it? and whether the same fruit which would now inflame any man living into a fever, or phrenzy, might not inflame *Adam* into a turbulence and irregularity of passion and appetite? and whether the same fluids which inflame the blood into irregularity of passion and appetite, may not naturally produce infection, and impair the constitution? Also, whether the same juice which now so affects the brain of an ordinary man, as to make him an idiot, might not so affect the brain of *Adam*, as to bring his understanding down to the present standard of ordinary men? and if this be possible, and not absurd to be supposed, it is evident the subsequent ignorance and corruption of human nature may clearly be accounted for on these suppositions; nay, I had almost said, upon any one of them? For the perfection of human nature consisting in the dominion of reason over the passions and appetites, whatever destroyed the absoluteness of that dominion, whether by inflaming the passions, or impairing the powers of reason, must of necessity destroy the perfection of human nature; and, in consequence of that, produce sin, guilt, and misery, in *Adam*, and entail it upon his posterity."—*Revelation examined with Candour*, vol. i. p. 8. Edit. 3.

an

an *infected soul*, for us to adopt that hypothesis, merely that we may not harmonize with the Schoolmen! The depravity of human nature may surely be maintained without running into such dangerous absurdities; for the body is an essential part of man, and if *it* be depraved, human *nature* must be depraved, even though every soul proceed, as the Schoolmen taught, immaculate from the hands of her Creator. In some families there is a species of madness, which has descended, through many generations, from father to son; and which, were families so infected to intermarry continually, would probably descend to the extinction of the race; but no physiologist, we apprehend, has ever thought of looking for the seat of the infection in the *soul*, or dreamed that the *soul*, if immaterial, passes from the parents to the children! On this question, therefore, we feel ourselves compelled by the force of truth to take the side of the Scholastics, however much we may differ from them in some of the inferences which they draw from it with respect to original sin.

"Original sin they directly opposed to original righteousness; and this they considered not as something connatural with man, but as a superinduced habit or adventitious ornament, the removal of which, according to the philosophical principles of the Stagirite, could not prove detrimental to the native powers of his mind. Hence they stated the former simply to be the loss or want of the latter; of an accomplishment unessential to his nature, of which it might be deprived, yet still retain its integrity inviolate. When therefore they contemplated the effects of the fall, by confining the evil to a corporeal taint, and not extending it to the nobler faculties of the soul, they regarded man as an object of divine displeasure, not because he possessed that, which was offensive, but because he was defective in that, which was pleasing to the Almighty. While, however, they laboured to diminish the effects, they augmented in equal proportion the responsibility of the first transgression, asserting, that all participated in the guilt of Adam. He, they said, received for himself and his posterity the gift of righteousness, which he subsequently forfeited; in his loins we were included, and by him were virtually represented: his will was ours, and hence the consequence of his lapse is justly imputable to us his descendants. By our natural birth therefore, under this idea, we are alienated from God, innocent in our individual persons, but guilty in that of him, from whom we derived our existence; a guilt which, although contracted through the fault of another, yet so closely adheres to us, that it effectually precludes our entrance at the gate of everlasting life, until the reception of a new birth in baptism.

"Thus they contended, that the lapse of Adam conveys to us solely *imputed guilt*, the corporeal infection, which they admitted, not being sin itself, but only the subject-matter of it, not *peccatum*, but, according to their phraseology, *fomes peccati*, a kind of fuel, which the human will kindles, or not, at pleasure. It required, however, no common talent at paradoxical solution to prove, what was pertinaciously held, the innocence of that occult quality, which disposes to crime without being itself criminal, which, void of all depravity, *renders the mind depraved*; that metaphorical fuel of the affections, which, although not vicious in

its own nature, yet, when inflamed, generates vice in the heart, upon which it preys." (Pp. 58-60.)

Every reader of attention must perceive, that this view of original sin is not consistent with itself; and whoever shall turn to the learned author's notes, will see that it is partly taken from different Schoolmen, who were not agreed on the subject, and partly from the report of the Lutherans. The report of the Lutherans, when unsupported by quotations from the Schoolmen themselves, must be received with some hesitation. No man can think more highly of Melancthon, in all respects, than the writer of this article, and few men are more thoroughly convinced of Luther's *integrity*; but it is hardly possible (such is the frailty of human nature) for men heated with controversy, as the first reformers were, to give such a report of the opinions of their antagonists as is entitled to implicit and unlimited credit. On the consequences of *the fall*, and on the subjects of *grace* and *free-will*, &c. the *sectarists* and *theorists* differed almost as much between themselves, as the Church of England, and the novel sect of *true churchmen*, differ at present. However, what is here said of Adam's having received for himself and his posterity *the gift of righteousness*; of our being *included in his loins*, and by him being *virtually represented*; of *his will being ours*; of his lapse being *justly imputable to his descendants*; and of *all participating in his guilt*, harmonizes exactly with the Westminster Confession of Faith, and is the Calvinism now taught in the Church of Scotland. On the other hand, that view of original sin, in which the consequences of the fall are represented as consisting of the loss of something *not connatural with man*; *in the removal of a superinduced habit*, is by no means peculiar to the scholastics. Bishop Bull has, in the third volume of his English works, completely proved, that, long before the æra of the Schoolmen, the doctrine of the Catholic church, on this subject, was,

"That our first parents, besides the seeds of *natural virtue and religion* sown in their minds in their very creation, and besides the *natural innocence and rectitude*, wherein also they were created, were endowed with certain *gifts and power supernatural*, infused by the Spirit of God; and that *in these gifts their perfection consisted*; that these gifts were bestowed to fit them for a supernatural immortality; and that Adam, in this state of integrity, had *naturally*, and without the aid of the Divine Spirit, no more power to perform righteousness available to *eternal life*, than the vine hath to bring forth wine, without the warm influence of the sun, the dew of heaven, and dressing."

This doctrine the Bishop himself adopted, and considered it as one of the main pillars of the Christian faith; for, upon any other hypothesis,

"I challenge," said he, "any man to show me, wherein that great fall of mankind, of which the Scriptures, and the writings of the Catholic Doctors, from the days of the Apostles to our present age, so loudly ring,

fing, can be supposed to consist. Hence," continues he, "may be gathered a clear solution of that question, so hotly agitated among modern divines, *whether the original righteousness of the first man was supernatural?* For the meaning of this question, if it signify any thing to any considerable purpose, is clearly this—whether Adam, in this state of integrity, *needed a supernatural principle* or *power*, in order to the performing of such a righteousness as, through the gracious acceptance of God, should have been available to an eternal and celestial life and happiness? And the question being thus stated, ought to be held in the *affirmative*, if the consistent determination of the church of God may be allowed its due weight in the balance of our judgments*."

* In adopting these opinions, Bishop Bull was by no means singular. Archbishop King, in his Sermon on the Fall of Man, says, "we must remember, that if man's understanding was (originally) never so clear, and his senses and faculties never so strong; yet, having made no observation, and being absolutely without experience, he could know no more of any thing than what was revealed by God to him. Therefore we must conceive that Adam was under the immediate conduct and direction of God, and was not to judge for himself, but was to leave himself entirely to be guided and directed by his Maker. You see he was not left to determine for himself what he should eat; but God, by revelation, assigned him his food, and provided it for him. It is to be considered that man, by his constitution, was mortal, and subject to the impressions of the bodies which surrounded him; for being composed of the elements, as to his material part, in which he resembled other living creatures, these might be separated and dissolved; and the separation of the parts of our body, infers death; and therefore man, in his natural composition, was subject to it, but yet was capable of immortality, to which he could not be entitled but from a *supernatural principle*, and the peculiar care of God."—Again, treating of the command given to Adam, he says, "We must consider that man was *fallible in his understanding*, *peccable in his will*, and *mortal in his body*; and therefore the preserving him from deceit, sin, and death, must be due to some *supernatural grace of God*; and that to confer that grace, there ought to be some obvious mean, easy to be known, and ready to be used."—He then shews the wisdom of the law under which the first pair were placed, and the means by which they were seduced from their duty; after which, speaking of the consequences of the fall, he observes, that one of these consequences was "their sense of their being naked, and shews that they were so. Shame proceeds from a consciousness of weakness, or of guilt, and from a secret pride that makes us unwilling to own it; lest we should be despised for it. Man could not be conscious of either before his fall, because he was innocent from guilt, and was covered by *the power of God* against all the defects of his *natural weakness*; but being now *left to himself*, he felt both. He had offended God, and had no defence against his fellow-creatures: the sun scorched him, the rain wet him, and the cold pierced him. He found an inconveniency in exposing his body, and was ashamed of the effects of it. He found himself moved with lust, and other irregular passions, and his reason unable to curb them. Whereas *the power of God*, whilst he was under the divine government, *had kept all his faculties in perfect order.*"

This seems to differ very little from the doctrine of the Schoolmen of the sect of the Scotists; and the same learned and excellent prelate agrees with that sect in another opinion of great importance. Our author, in his notes (p. 259), refers to Scotus himself, as teaching that the punishment due to what he calls *imputed guilt*, consists merely in a deprivation of the beatific vision; and Bishop Bull thus expresses himself of the covenant made with man in Paradise:

"Fœdus vitæ cum *Adamo* initum in statu integro per ipsius peccatum irritum fuit non modò ipsi, sed et posteris ipsius; ut jam omnes *Adæ* filii, quà tales, sint filii mortis, h. e. à promisso omni vitæ immortalis penitus exclusi, ac moriendi necessitati, ABSQUE SPE RESURRECTIONIS, subjecti. NULLA EST IN UNIVERSA THEOLOGIA HAC PREPOSITIONE CERTIOR. Passim enim in Scripturis Novi Testamenti apertissimè ac verbis disertissimis traditur; presertim in Epist. ad *Rom.* cap. *v*, fere per totum. Unde et probati ecclesiæ veteris doctores universi, tum qui ante, tum qui post *Pelagium* vixere, in ea consenserunt; neque unquam à quoquam impunè et sine hæreseos natâ negata fuit."

Instead of accounting for this dispensation by the unintelligible hypothesis of *imputed guilt**, and far from puzzling himself with the question, whether the infection derived from Adam be sin itself, the Bishop vindicates the ways of God to man by the following obvious and incontrovertible argument:

"Jure autem patuisse Deum ob solum *Adami* peccatum posteros ipsius omnes à vita immortali excludere, nimis manifestum est. Nem (ut optimè Cl. Gerardus J. Vossius) licet *Adam non peccasset*, poterat tamen Deus, qui liberrimus est donorum morum dispensator, creare hominem ad finem naturalem, eòque et *gratiæ in hâc vita*, et *post hanc vitam gloriæ expertem*. Evidentissimum autem est, quod poterat Deus absolutè, idem potuisse relatè, hoc est, cum respectu ad primum primorum parentum delictum: quò simul ostendet, se justi Judicis officio perfungi†."

Such was the doctrine, not of Bishop Bull only, but also of Archbishop King, Sherlock, afterwards Bishop of London, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Wells, and all the other eminent divines, whose theological writings adorned the Church of England about the beginning of the last

---

* This hypothesis, if it be not unintelligible, is something much worse—it is impious. "In hoc autem peccati genere potest quis esse aut haberi reus, pœnasque luere culpæ ab altero commissæ. Fieri hoc posse, ut insons dicetur reus per iniquum judicem, atque pœnas luet a potenti domino, non nego. Fieri quidem et potest per absolutam dominationem, quam solemus appellare tyrannidem. Sed id fiat licet nihil mutat in rationibus justi et injusti, nec proinde fieri potest omnino ab æquo judice dominoque, qualis et Deus optimus. A Deo, inquam, fieri non potest, ob suam perfectionem et sanctitatem."—*Burnet de Fide et Officiis Christianarum.*

† App. ad Examen Animadversionis 17.

century;

century; nor are we aware that any other doctrine on this subject was taught in our Church by a man of true learning, till it became the fashion to neglect the writings of the primitive fathers, and to adopt, in their stead, either the criticisms and speculations of a futile philosophy on the one hand, or the gloomy doctrines of Calvin on the other. That our reformers paid a due regard to the authority of the fathers of the primitive church, is apparent from their preface to the Book of Common Prayer; and that they were not misled, when drawing up the Articles of Religion, by a vain philosophy, or an undue deference to the Apostle of Geneva, is equally apparent from the following account of the conduct of their Lutheran guides.

"Avoiding all intricate questions upon the subject, they taught, that original sin is a corruption of our nature in a general sense, a depravation of the mental faculties and the corporeal appetites; that the resplendent image of the Deity, which man received at the creation of the world, although not annihilated, is nevertheless greatly impaired; and that in consequence the bright characters of unspotted sanctity, once deeply engraven on his mind by the hand of the living God, are become obliterated, the injury extending to his intellect, and affecting as well his reason and his will, as his affections and passions. When therefore they contended, as frequently they did, that our nature is corrupted, they contrasted the position with the scholastical doctrine of its integrity: and when they urged its total corruption, they opposed the idea of a deterioration in one part only, and even that consisting of a propensity void of sin. To conceive that inclination to evil incurs not in itself the disapprobation of Heaven, appeared to them little better than an apology for crime; or at least a dangerous palliation of that, which the Christian's duty compels him not only to represss, but to abhor.

"Yet while they argued, that in consequence of this depravity we are to be considered by our natural birth as the children of wrath, they admitted, that by our new birth in baptism we all are made the children of grace. When however, on this occasion, they pressed the necessity of complying with a gospel institution, we must not suppose them to have understood that expression in its strongest sense, as excluding from every hope of mercy, those whom involuntary accident or incapacity has prevented from participating in the Christian covenant." (Pp. 60-62.)

This extract is taken by our author from the writings of Melancthon and Luther; and on that account, as well as on some others, we doubt if it be altogether just to the Schoolmen. To conceive that *inclination* to evil, *as evil*, incurs not in itself the disapprobation of Heaven, is such a gross absurdity, that nothing but the most direct evidence could convince us that it had ever entered into the discriminating head of Scotus. That evidence, however, is not furnished by the note to which our author refers. There, indeed, we find Melancthon saying, "Adversarii docent, naturalem illam impotentiam, et inclinationes *legi Dei contrarias, peccata non esse*;" but before we infer from this that the adversaries conceived *inclination to evil* not to incur the disapprobation of Heaven, we must know first what *natural*

inclinations we have that are contrary to the laws of God; and secondly, what laws of God are here meant. Luther, in the same note, expressly excepts from these sinful inclinations, "*appetitus cibi et potus, amor conjugis, liberorum, et parentum*, et *similes affectus*; and admits that these "*etiam in integra naturâ extitissent*;" but we think it may be doubted whether we derive immediately from Nature any other appetites than these, and such as these. *Envy* is a passion, indeed, radically evil; but it certainly is not derived by generation from Adam; for there have been many individuals, in whose hearts it had no place; and the process of its formation has been frequently and clearly traced*. It may be doubted, we think, whether *ambition* be connate with the mind of man, for it seems to depend upon the state of society; but whether it be or not, surely it cannot be said that every kind and every degree of ambition is sinful. Every appetite, when excessive, leads to sin; and so it would have done in the paradisaical state, had it not been checked by the spirit of God: but a man is not surely a sinner merely because his appetites are strong, if he have been enabled so to curb them, as to deny them every gratification not consistent with those wise purposes for which they were implanted in his breast. *Propensio ad venerem* is generally the concomitant of youthful vigour and good health; it is, indeed, in the opinion of some of the most eminent physicians of the age, inseparable from that state; but is there any thing sinful in health and vigour? Nay, that propensity itself may, in some cases, be the occasion of *virtue* instead of *vice*; for if he who feels it in its strongest degree, conduct himself as regularly as he who hardly feels it at all, the former is surely the more virtuous man of the two.

It is, however, true, that in order to fit ourselves for that state of future felicity, in which we shall neither eat nor drink; marry, nor be given in marriage; but be wholly spiritual as the angels of God in Heaven, we must endeavour gradually to eradicate our sensual appetites, as soon as they have answered the purposes of the present life; for "the flesh and the spirit being contrary the one to the other," such appetites would render us incapable of relishing those good things which God hath prepared for all who love and fear him. The inclinations of the flesh, therefore, have, as our Article teaches, so far the *nature* of sin, as to render us unfit for the kingdom of Heaven, because they are "contrary to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus;" and if this were all that the Schoolmen meant by "inclinationes legi Dei contrarias," they might say with truth, "*peccata non esse*;" because, while the struggle between the flesh and the spirit continues, such inclinations must be occasionally felt; and though they unfit him who feels them for the happiness of Heaven, they cannot, if resisted, subject him justly to the pains of hell. But we shall

* By Locke, Hartley, and the author of the Dissertation prefixed to King's Origin of Evil, &c. &c.

have

have occasion to enter into this subject more fully bye-and-bye, when we state what we believe to be the sense of our own Article *on original sin:* in the mean time, we return to our author.

"Upon the whole, their (the Reformers') adversaries rested much upon the following philosophical truths; that we ought not to be esteemed virtuous or vicious, worthy of praise or censure, merely on account of involuntary passions; that all sin is determinable by the act of the will; and that human nature is not evil. This they readily admitted in its proper place, when applied to a suitable object, and brought before a suitable tribunal, the doctrine of morals and the judgment of mankind: but they reprobated the attempt of introducing it in order to supersede Christianity, and to prove from it the purity of man in the estimation of God; of him, 'in whose sight the very heavens are not clean, and who chargeth his angels with folly.' If therefore they dwelt much upon the dark side of the question, it was no more than the occasion demanded; the bright side of it had been long held up by the Church of Rome in so fallacious a point of view, that it seemed almost impossible to err in that respect." (Pp. 63, 64.)

In this conclusion we cannot acquiesce. Though the Church of Rome had erred on one side, it surely was not impossible to err on the other; and Dr. Laurence, we are persuaded, will readily admit, that no opinions which have been attributed to Scotus and his followers, on the subject of *original sin*, are more erroneous, or more dangerous, than the contrary opinions of Calvin on the same subject. That Luther and his adherents proceeded in the course which they are here said to have pursued, we have not a doubt; nor are we inclined to blame them, though, in their controversies with the Church of Rome, they sometimes carried their opposition too far. In such a situation as their's, extremities were unavoidable; but when they sat down, *not to write controversies*, but to *compile formularies of faith* for the use of the Church, it is to be hoped that they withdrew their attention wholly from the writings of the Schoolmen, and directed it steadily to the Holy Scriptures, and the traditionary interpretations* of those Scriptures which may be collected from the writings of the three first centuries, before the subtleties of a vain philosophy had much corrupted the simple though sublime doctrines of the Gospel. If this was their conduct, when they set themselves to draw up the

* The opinion of a single father, or, indeed, of many fathers, respecting the sense of any passage of Scripture, is of no value, unless supported by sound reasoning and sober criticism; and as reasoners and critics, those men were in general far from eminent. When we find them, however, agreeing with each other in the interpretation of any text, and declaring that it has been so understood from the beginning, wherever the Gospel has been preached, the case is very different, and he would be a bold man who should controvert such an interpretation, unless it be obviously contrary to the grammatical sense of the words so interpreted, or lead to impiety or absurdity.

doctrine which they wished to establish respecting the consequences of Adam's transgression, they would banish from their minds the opinions of Aquinas, Scotus, &c. on the subject, and endeavour to discover what had been taught by Moses, the prophets, Christ, and his apostles; convinced, as they all declared themselves to be, that whatsoever may not be proved by the Scriptures (whether it be true or not) is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Christian faith.

As Adam fell by transgressing the commandment recorded in the 17th verse of the 2d chapter of the book of Genesis, it is obvious that the consequences of his fall must be implied in the meaning of the words which our translators have rendered, "thou shalt surely die," and that he must himself have fully understood those words. If the reformers wished to understand them likewise, they would of course begin by inquiring how they had been used by Moses on other occasions. Now they occur in the Pentateuch at least twenty-nine times*; but they are never, except in the two important passages (Gen. ii. 17, and iii. 4) of which we are inquiring into the sense, to be understood to mean any other kind of death than that which is common to man and beast; as the reader may convince himself, by turning to the texts referred to at the bottom of the page. But we should be glad to know by what canon of criticism we are authorised to interpret the two passages in question, so as to give to the words "thou shalt surely die," a sense quite different from what they will bear any where else in the books of Moses, and quite different, likewise, from what is their most obvious and natural sense even in these two passages themselves. Could Adam, when he was told that, on eating the forbidden fruit, he should *surely die*, imagine that, instead of passing to his former state insensible, this threat implied that the natural faculties of his mind should be depraved; that he should propagate a depraved race; and that, on account of this natural depravity, he and they should be liable to suffer the pains of hell for ever?

We are perfectly aware, and so doubtless was he, that the human soul is of an order superior to the souls, or vital principles, of the brutes that perish, and that it does not *necessarily* die with the body; but he must have been likewise aware, that its existence, as well as the existence of every thing created, depends upon the will of God, and that therefore it *might* die with the body, or survive it, according to the good pleasure of the Father of Spirits. To the apostate pair, a ray of comfort was held out in the promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent; but without that promise, they could surely derive no hopes of any kind of immortality from the

* Gen. ii. 17; iii. 4; xx. 7; xxvi. 11. Exod. xix. 12; xxi. 12, 15, 16, 17; xxii. 19 (in the Heb. 18); xxxi. 14, 15. Lev. xx. 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 27; xxiv. 16, 17; xxvii. 29. Numb. xv. 35; xxvi. 65; xxxv. 17, 18, 21, 31.

sentence:

sentence: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

If this be not sufficient evidence that the penalty denounced against the first transgression, was neither more nor less than death in the most absolute sense of the word, as it denotes the loss of conscious existence, it may be corroborated by the testimony of our blessed Lord himself, and his apostle, St. Paul. When Jesus said to Martha, "I am the resurrection and the life," it is obvious, from the context, that his meaning was not that he was the first *revealer* of a resurrection from the dead, but that he was the *author* of it, and that every well-grounded hope of living in a future state rests on him. Accordingly St. Paul says*, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they, also, who are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished—ἀπώλοντο, are lost," as if they had never been. That this is the meaning of the verb ἀπώλοντο is rendered indisputable by the 22d verse, in which we are assured, that "as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive;" for if the death which all incurred by the fall of Adam, was any thing else than the forfeiture of immortality, it is evidently not true that as in Adam *all die, even so* in Christ shall *all be made alive.*"

When all title to immortality was forfeited, those supernatural graces of the Holy Spirit, or that teaching of God, which the primitive fathers, as well as Bishop Bull and Archbishop King among the moderns, call sometimes *original righteousness*, and sometimes the *divine image*, were forfeited likewise; for those graces, or that teaching, being originally intended to guide man on his way to Heaven†, must of course have been withdrawn when Heaven was shut against him.

"Part of man's punishment" (says Archbishop King) "was the withdrawing of the extraordinary grace of God from him, that was ready to guide and direct him in all his actions, and leaving him to his own power and faculties to conduct and support him. So I understand the 22d verse of the 3d chapter: *And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil. And now least he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden.* Some take this for an ironical

---

* 1st Cor. xv. 16, 17, 18.

† It was the doctrine of the primitive church, and it is a doctrine which might easily be proved from the Scriptures, that under the first covenant man was not intended to live for ever on this earth; but that after a sufficient probation here, he was, without tasting death, to be translated into some superior state, or Heaven. Into this discussion our limits permit us not to enter; but we refer the reader with confidence to Bishop Bull's Dissertation *on the State of Man before the Fall.*

speech,

speech, whereby God mocked and upbraided man for his folly. But I rather think it a declaration of the divine will; for since man had taken on him to choose for himself, and to judge what was good and evil for him without consulting his Maker, therefore God resolved to deprive him of the supernatural assistance he designed to afford him, and leave him to his natural faculties to guide and direct him; let him be, as it were, his own God, and enjoy the fruit of his choice. To this purpose he deprived him of the use of the tree of life, drove him out of the garden where it was, and fenced it against him.

"The effects of man's being left to his own power and faculties for his direction and support, are many and fatal. It is easy to shew that from hence come all the errors and follies of our lives. For our understandings being finite, we are every moment at a loss, we are forced in most things to guess, and being unable to find the truth, are frequently mistaken. From the same come all the sins, corruptions and crimes that overwhelm the world. For being left to our choice, we not only mistake, but choose amiss. One error, or sin, makes way for another; we proceed daily in corruption, and the infection spreads as the world grows older. Custom, education and company, do all contribute to make us worse and worse; and in nothing of all this is God to be blamed. We bring these on ourselves, and they are not to be prevented without a miracle, which no one can say God is obliged to work for us *."

This profound reasoner, and most orthodox Divine, neither charges God with injustice, by talking of *imputed guilt*, nor perplexes himself and his readers with the question, which never can be solved, *whether the natural powers of the human mind* were depraved by the fall of the first man; but proves that all which has been forfeited by Adam, might, with perfect justice on the part of the Deity, have been withheld from his descendants, though he himself had never fallen; and that all the natural and moral evil of the world may be fairly accounted for by the withdrawing of that supernatural aid, which was vouchsafed to the parents of mankind in Paradise. In these sentiments Bishop Bull agrees with him; though he admits, as the Schoolmen admitted, that a taint *may* have been transmitted from Adam to the *corporeal* part of every individual of the human race.

"Cæterum patres illi, qui negârunt, hominem per gratiam Christi, quæ in Evangelio promittitur, posse legem perfecti implere ac sine peccato esse, videntur mihi legem intellexisse κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, nempe originalem illam, quæ primum hominem in statu integro obligavit, perfectissimumque fuit exemplar legis æternæ; ac peccati vocem *minus proprie* accepisse pro quoticunque nævo sine defectu, qui licèt jam humano generi in pœnam primi peccati naturalis factus sit, neque ullo modo in hâc vitâ penitus exui possit adeoque non sit propriè ac formaliter peccatum, sed potius, ut dixi, peccati primi pœna; tamen est quædam à lege æterna, sive a creationis lege deflexio. In hunc peccati censum venit illa concupiscentiæ sol-

* Sermon on the Fall of Man.

licitatio,

licitatio, quæ optimos in hac mortali vita plùs minùsve perpetuó exercet, etiamsi nullum omnino voluntatis assensum extorqueat: item defectus illi omnes atque infirmitates, quæ *prorsus necessario* profluunt a vitioso humani *corporis* temperamento primum peccatum consecuto, sine ab *amissione exquisitissimæ illius* ἐυκρασίας, *qua in creatione sua donatus fuit Protoplastes, quamque, nisi peccasset, conservare potuisset per esum ligni vitæ, ipsi a Deo concessum* *."

If this be compared with what we have quoted (p. 9) from the English works of the same eminently learned and pious man, no doubt can remain what side of this alternative he adopted. He who affirmed, in one work, that the original righteousness of the first man was *supernatural*, cannot with candour be supposed to have taught, in another, that the forfeiture of that righteousness consisted in the positive depravation of his *natural* faculties. The question, however, to be discussed here is, whether this primitive view of the consequences of the first transgression be consonant with the doctrine of our Church; for though the two Prelates were men of the highest abilities and integrity, they were yet liable to mistake, and may have deceived themselves when they subscribed the Articles, as they undoubtedly believed, in their literal and grammatical sense. That they did deceive themselves is incontrovertible, if our author's interpretation of the Ninth Article be perfectly correct; but whilst this is admitted on the one hand, it will not surely be denied on the other, either that Dr. Laurence is as liable to mistake as they were, or that the language cannot be remarkable for perspicuity and precision, which he and they have interpreted differently.

"The application of what has been observed" (says Dr. L.) "to the Article of our Church upon the same subject, has been already, perhaps anticipated. Original sin is there defined to be, *the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.* When we recollect the peculiar theory of the scholastics, we immediately perceive with what this definition was intended to be contrasted. According to their statement, original sin is nothing more than a defect of original righteousness, which instead of being a connatural quality, was itself only a supernatural ornament, unessential to the soul. In opposition, therefore, to such a conceit, our Church represents it to be the fault and corruption of every man's *nature*, not the loss of a *superadded grace*, but the vitiation of his innate powers; a vitiation, by which he is very far removed from original righteousness, and by which she subjoins, again repeating the word before used as distinctly expressive of her meaning, he is inclined to evil *of his own nature*; so that his passions continually resist the controul of his reason. Yet while she esteems

* Appendix ad Examen Animadversionis, 17, § 15.

it

it not, as her adversaries held, an innocuous propensity, she does not declare it to be punishable as a crime; but steering a middle course, with a moderation, for which she is always remarkable, asserts it only to be *deserving* of God's displeasure *. After the preceding definition, to which none but the sophists of the schools could object, she proceeds to observe, in perfect conformity with common sense, and with the doctrine of the Lutherans, that this depravation of nature remains after baptism, so that concupiscence, or whatever else may be meant by the φρόνημα σαρκὸς of St. Paul, is not, as the Council of Trent had then recently maintained, and as the Church of Rome had always believed it to be, a sinless inclination; but one rebelling against the law of God, and which, according to the Apostle, who nevertheless admits that there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, retains in itself the nature of sin."—(P. 64—66.)

That the Article of our Church, thus interpreted, is Lutheran and not Calvinistical, cannot be denied; and that the language of it will admit of this interpretation we feel not ourselves inclined to controvert; but we are persuaded that it will likewise admit of an interpretation somewhat different from this, for it is certainly less precise and perspicuous than the language of any other of our existing Articles.

The phrase, *original righteousness*, cannot be taken literally in the sense in which the word *righteousness* is *now* used by any party; for, in *that* sense, Adam, when immediately created, was neither *righteous* nor *unrighteous*. He was, indeed, *innocent*, but however perfect we may suppose his nature to have been, he had *then done* neither good nor evil; and we know, on the highest authority, that it is only "he who *doth* righteousness, that is righteous." By the phrase, *original righteousness*, therefore, must be understood, either that Adam's appetites were under complete subjection to his moral and intellectual power, or that he was in all things of importance directed by the superadded grace of God's good spirit, for another alternative is plainly inconceivable. That his appetites were *not* under such complete subjection as Dr. Laurence seems to suppose, is apparent from his conduct; for we learn from Moses † and St. Paul †, that Adam was not deceived by the serpent, but seduced by his wife; and it deserves to be considered, whether, on that occasion, he betrayed not more of the φρόνημα σαρκος, than his descendant Joseph afterwards betrayed, when

---

* This is not the language of the Article. The lusting of the flesh contrary to the spirit deserveth, according to the Article, "God's *wrath* and *damnation*;" and the meaning of these words may probably be discovered, by comparing them with the same words as used 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16. and 1 Cor. xi. 29, 30. Our author, indeed, admits (Notes, p. 271), that damnation does not here imply God's final condemnation to hell-fire, and quotes Bishop Hooper, one of the Reformers, as speaking of persons *damned by the magistrates*.

† Gen. chap. iii. and 1 Tim. ii. 14.

he

he resisted the solicitations of Potiphar's wife. Is it not, therefore, more reasonable to suppose that our Reformers understood the phrase, *original righteousness*, as it had been understood by the primitive Church, and by those authors of more recent date, with whose works they had all been conversant; than that they employed it in a sense, at once modern, and directly contrary to facts, recorded by those who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?

The Article, indeed, appears to have been directed not so much against the Schoolmen, as against the *Anabaptists*, who had lately revived the heresy of Pelagius on this subject; for, as it was agreed upon in 1552, it ran thus:—"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk, which also the *Anabaptists* do now a-days renew *(ut fabulantur Pelagiani, et hodie Anabaptistæ repetunt)*;" thus condemning both these sects, but passing not the slightest censure on the doctrine of the Schoolmen. Dr. Laurence indeed says *, that in every part of the definition of original sin adopted by our Reformers, the attack is made principally against the Papists; that the error of the Anabaptists seems to have been introduced merely for the purpose of less openly declaring the object of assault; and that the clause respecting the Anabaptists was consequently omitted in 1562, when *disguise* was less necessary, or less regarded. But for all this no evidence whatever is produced. By comparing the Articles, of *works done before justification*, and *purgatory*, as they were drawn up in 1552, with those which are now established on the same subjects, the reader will perceive that Cranmer and his friends scrupled as little as Parker to censure the Schoolmen directly, when they deemed them worthy of censure; and yet, when treating of *original sin* they kept them, it seems from delicacy, entirely out of view, and answered them only through the sides of the Anabaptists! But if, as our author says, these substitutes were dropt, when disguise was less necessary, how came the *Pelagians* to be retained, and still no mention to be made of the *Schoolmen?*

The answer to this question seems to be, that, on the subject of original sin, the doctrines of Pelagius and the Schoolmen have little or nothing in common; and that our Reformers never intended to class them together, or to pass on them the same censure. Pelagius taught that Adam would have died, whether he had eaten of the forbidden fruit or not; that his transgression affected himself only; that death is not the consequence of that transgression, but proceeds from the necessity of nature; that man stands not in need of divine aid to enable him to subdue his appetites, and perform all that is required of him; and that by the grace of Christ nothing more is meant than his doctrine and his example †. To these doctrines the scholastic view of original

* Note, p. 269.

† We know little of the peculiar doctrines of Pelagius, but from Augustine,

original sin, which our author exhibits, bears no resemblance; and we need hardly say, that the doctrine of our Church, as understood by Bishop Bull and Archbishop King, is farther removed from Pelagianism, than the same doctrine as understood by Dr. Laurence. The man can be in very little danger of flattering human pride, or of claiming any thing as the reward of human merit, who is aware that no created being has a title to eternal life, either as the right of his nature, or as the reward of his obedience; and who believes that even in Paradise man could perform nothing acceptable to his Maker, but through the grace of God, preventing him and working with him.—Such appears to have been the doctrine of the primitive Church; such was indisputably the doctrine of those eminent Divines of our own Church, to whom we have already referred; and such, we believe, to be the sense of our Article. When God placed man in the Garden of Eden, he appears to have in effect said to him:—

"Your nature requires that you should *choose* those things, the enjoyment whereof will make you happy. I will make your duty easy to you: abstain from this one tree, and whilst you do, I will take care that you shall not chuse amiss in any thing else. Your obedience in this shall be an infallible means to secure you from choosing wrong in any other thing. Whilst you use your free-will right in this, I will take care that you shall not abuse it on any other occasion. You are sufficient to conduct yourself properly as a man upon earth; but you are now by covenant made the heir of immortality and heaven, to which you are not sufficient to guide yourself. I will, therefore, be your guide in all things, if by violation of the covenant you do not forfeit your title to immortality, and thereby render my supernatural direction superfluous *."

If this be a just view of the state of man before the fall, and to the present writer it has long appeared to be just, the original righteousness mentioned in the Eighth Article, must be looked upon as essential to man, considered only as an heir of heaven and immortality, but as not essential to him, considered merely as a rational and sentient inhabitant of this earth. When Heaven, therefore, was forfeited, this original righteousness was forfeited likewise; and it was restored to us as our title to Heaven, and immortality was restored only through the interposition of our Redeemer, who was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. But though every regenerate Christian is influenced by the same spirit, which was the guide of Adam in Paradise, the lust of the flesh, which is often strongly felt, even by the

---

gustine, by whom they were opposed and confuted. Perhaps the most impartial account of them extant, within a very small compass, is given by Cave, in *Hist. Literaria*; and it is of that account that we have given the substance in the text.

* See King's Sermon on the Fall, not for the *words* which we have used, but for the *doctrine*.

best

best men, and probably would have been felt under the first covenant, as it is under the second, hath in itself so much of the *nature* of sin, as to render every one, in whom it is *not subdued*, unfit for the society of the blessed in Heaven.

Such appears to us to be the doctrine of the Scriptures of the primitive Church, and of the Church of England, respecting the consequences of Adam's transgression. We are perfectly aware that to many of the most eminent Divines, among whom we have no hesitation to class our author, those consequences appear to involve, besides the forfeiture of immortality and of divine grace, a *positive depravation of the moral and intellectual powers of man*, so that he is now less able to resist his sensual appetites, than he would have been, if the forbidden fruit had not been tasted. This doctrine *may* be true; but we can find no evidence of its truth, whilst it seems utterly irreconcileable with the short history of man in Paradise. The question, however, is not of the smallest importance; for we shall certainly be called to account at the day of judgment, for the employment of the talents which we have received, and not of those which have been withheld from us, and shall be judged each according to his own deeds, and not according to the deeds of another—whether progenitor or descendant.—"Ut quisque suum partet onus atque sui operis mercedem referat, est lex æqui, Deique judicio æquissimi. (*Exod.* xxxii. 32, 33. *Deut.* xxiv. 16. *Ezek.* xviii. 20. *Gal.* vi. 5. 1 *Cor.* iii. 8.) In hoc judicio stamus cadimusve."

(To be continued.)

A Vindication of the Celts, from Ancient Authorities: with Observations on Mr. Pinkerton's Hypothesis concerning the Origin of the European Nations, in his Modern Geography, and Dissertation on the Scythians, or Goths. 8vo. Pp. 172. Williams, and Longman and Co. 1803.

THE acquirement of notoriety seems to be as strong a passion in authors, as that of riches in the trading part of the community; and neither of them appears to be averse from the *quoquo modo* of acquirement. We mean not to say, that there are not many writers who court the approbation of the public by the fair and honest means of conveying instruction, or innocent amusement; or that there are not many traders who are not only just, but liberal in their dealings; but, to drop the traders for the present, we *will* say that, since authorship has become a craft, the notoriety, and consequent emolument of the writer, instead of the information of the reader, have too generally been the objects in view. Hence, instead of truth, the author thinks only of novelty, and new systems of taste, religion, and polity, are poured upon us from every quarter. The Olympus of ages and

experience

experience is assailed on all sides; and, though the assailants are not giants, yet, as assailants, they contrive to be conspicuous to the spectators—they sometimes gain their ends.

Our motives to action are known only to Omniscience, for even the individual is often blind to his own motives. We will not, therefore, determine whether an overweening conceit, or a passion for notoriety, or both, have influenced Mr. Pinkerton's career; but it is certain that in many of his works he has shewn himself more solicitous to advance what was new and strange, than what was true.—In taste, religion, and antiquities, under his plastic hands, old things are done away, and lo! all things are become new. Virgil and Horace, hitherto the delight of ages, this professor of legerdemain has converted into a pair of blockheads, worshipped by as great blockheads as themselves. In an elementary work on Geography, professedly intended for the use of schools, he endeavours to set aside the Scripture Chronology, and all that is said of the creation, deluge, &c. in the first chapters of Genesis; and thus leads the minds of our youth to reject the religion of their fathers.

The work now before us is written against another of those notorious crotchets produced by the ever-fermenting brain of Mr. Pinkerton. It has been his will and pleasure, it seems, to conceive a most rooted antipathy to the *Celts*; and he is a most exquisite *hater*—the true Elisha of Elijah Ritson. It is a passion, a rage—no lover ever adored his mistress with half the ardour that he abhors this, by him, detested people. They are, according to him, a race so truly despicable, a cast so utterly vile and degraded, that there never was an instance of a *real Celt* having attained to any degree of mental excellence. What was to be expected from a history of this people from the hand of their abhorrer? He has been at more pains to conceal, pervert, or falsify the testimony of antiquity, than it would have cost him to establish the truth. But, system once adopted, becomes a favourite child, and the ardour of defence is in general proportioned to the feebleness of the adopted brat.

The writer of this Vindication follows him, step by step, through all his windings and tergiversations, and overturns his baseless fabric. The nature of our publication does not permit us to enter minutely into the examination of the numerous passages from a variety of authors, and of the reasonings deduced from them, on which the question depends; this could not be done satisfactorily without extending this review to too great a length, on a subject little suited to the general class of readers.

Before the author of the Vindication proceeds to examine Mr. Pinkerton's Celtic, or rather Anti-Celtic system, he animadverts on what the latter has advanced in his Geography against the Chronology of the Scriptures, the procession of the human race from a single pair, and against the account given of the Deluge in the book of Genesis. We lay before our readers Mr. Pinkerton's objections to the Deluge, with the answer of his antagonist.

Mr.

Mr. Pinkerton says:

"The latest and best natural philosophers pronounce the flood impossible; and their reasons, grounded on mathematical truth, and the immutable laws of Nature, have my full assent. The Jews believed the earth a vast plain, and that the rain came from a collection of waters above the firmament (Gen. i. 7), as the earth floated on another mass of waters, (Gen. vii. 11), both of which were opened at the Deluge. As such waters are now mathematically known not to exist, and the earth is found spherical, the effect must cease with the cause. M. de Buffon has shewn that all the earth was at first under sea."

To this it is answered:—

"Before he wrote this singular passage, the author ought to have considered that the Supreme Being, who created the world, might, with equal ease, cause it to be overflowed with water. He has obviously misunderstood two passages in Scripture: and his mathematical inferences demonstrate him to be ignorant both of mathematics and natural philosophy. While he seems to infer, if he infers any thing, that a spherical surface could not be covered with water, he adds, in the very next sentence, 'Mr. Buffon has shewn, that *all the earth was at first under sea.*'"

So much for the general reasoning, and mathematical knowledge of Mr. Pinkerton.

In proportion as the *Celts* are an abomination to Mr. Pinkerton, his bowels yearn with every fraternal, and protectorial feeling towards the *Scythæ*, *Getæ*, or *Goths*, who, he assures us, were the same people under these various names. He issues his *fiat*, and behold them established in an empire, extending from Egypt to the Ganges, and from the Persian Gulph, and Indian Sea, to the Caspian, 3660 years before Christ, that is, only 344 years after that period which the drivelling mass of mankind have assigned to the creation of the world; founding the belief on the basis of Scripture, which, to Mr. Pinkerton, appears to be the basis of unbelief. Not contented with this wide domain, 2160 years before Christ, they passed the Araxes, and pouring like a deluge over the nations they approached, completely peopled Thrace, Illyricum, Greece, and part of Asia Minor 1500 years, Italy about 1000 years, Germany and Scandinavia, with a great part of Gaul and Spain, about 500, and passed into Britain, Ireland, and Scotland, about 300 years, before the Christian æra. In short, the wild, and unsupported hypothesis of Mr. Pinkerton, amounts to this, that Greeks, Romans, Germans, Gauls, all those deemed the ancient inhabitants, and, of course, all the modern inhabitants of Europe, are *Goths*, or at least completely *Gothicised* (for we do not recollect his alleging that their progress was accompanied by extirpation), except, perhaps, one or two insignificant tribes, of which the Celts are the most degraded and despicable; nay, the most despicable race on the face of the earth. "Wisdom and ingenuity," says he, "may be traced among the Samoides, Laplanders, Negroes, &c. but, among the Celts, none of native growth."

These dreams, originating in a diseased and perverted intellect, seem not to require a serious contradiction. The author of the Vindication has, however, examined the foundation of this *Gothic* fabric, and found the structure raised upon the sand. He has proved that this Scythic, Getic, or Gothic Empire, as exhibited by Mr. Pinkerton, never had an existence, except in the brain of its fabricator.—That the appellation of Scythians, as given by the ancients, was so vague that no decisive inferences can be drawn from it;—that the Getæ, Goths, and Scythæ, were the same people, is therefore far from historic truth, as Mr. Pinkerton asserts;—that the Celts had overspread a great part of Europe long before the appearance of the Goths;—that even so late as the time of Cæsar's commanding in Gaul, not only what was called Gallia Celtica, but what was called the Belgic division of that country, was peopled chiefly by Celts; and that as late as the time of Tacitus, Germany itself was inhabited by a mixture of Germans, Celts, and Sarmatians;—that the Celts were not, therefore, that miserable and contemptible horde, as represented by Mr. Pinkerton; nor his favourite Goths, that ancient, and universal race of conquerors and colonizers, he has asserted them to be.

This result is produced by shewing that Mr. Pinkerton's ancient authorities are either misunderstood, garbled, perverted, or nothing to the purpose; and by bringing forward other ancient authorities, which still farther evince the futility of the hypothesis.

To bolster up his hypothesis, Mr. Pinkerton is compelled to have recourse to assumptions the most absurd and monstrous. One of these we shall mention. To account for the wide-spread of Scythic, Getic, or Gothic population and conquest, he assures us, "as some kind of animals are more prolific than others, so also may certain races of men; as the Scythæ, or Goths, UNDOUBTEDLY were." And *undoubtedly* they must have been so, *if* they performed half the progressive and populating feats attributed to them, by this their devoted historian; who, among other matters equally wonderful, tells us, that when Cæsar landed in Britain, he found the southern part of it, exclusive of the Celts, whom they had cooped up in a corner of the island, inhabited by between 3 and 4,000,000 of Goths! What is Mahomet and his boasted procreative vigour? What even the genial night of Hercules himself with the fifty Thespian virgins, to the Goths of Mr. Pinkerton! But we forget that Hercules was a Greek, *i. e.* one of Mr. Pinkerton's Goths; and are rather surprized that he has not brought forward this anecdote, among his other *historic truths*, as a proof of Gothic prolific superiority.

The following extract will give our readers an idea of what the author of this publication has endeavoured to prove, and what we think he has proved, in opposition to Mr. Pinkerton.

"GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

"From a retrospective view of the authorities which have been produced from the ancient writers, we may now draw the following inferences:

"1. The

" 1. The Kymry, or Celts, had overspread the greatest part of Europe at the first dawn of history, and formed the principal population of Gaul, both Transalpine and Cisalpine, till a late period of the Roman Republic.

" 2. About 120 years before the time of Cæsar, the Romans, having conquered Cisalpine Gaul, extended their power beyond the Alps, and formed the south-eastern part of Transalpine Gaul into a Roman province; but the great mass of the people still remained Gallic, or Celtic, though intermixed with their conquerors.

" 3. As late as the time of Polybius, that part of Gaul, afterwards called Aquitania, was possessed by the Celts; and according to Pliny, appears to have been denominated Armorica, signifying a maritime country, the same name which was afterwards appropriated to Bretagne.—After the time of Polybius, and before that of Augustus, this country was invaded by a people from Spain, called Iberi, who, either driving out, or mixing with the natives, formed a race, differing, according to Strabo, from the natives of the other parts of Gaul.

" 4. As late as the time of Cæsar, and even afterwards, the middle part, or the greater portion of Gaul, comprizing, according to his account, the territory between the Garonne, the Seine, the Roman province, the Alps, and the Upper Rhine, was inhabited by people who may be termed *unmixed* Celtic tribes.

" 5. That part of Gaul, called Belgic by Cæsar, included between the Seine and the Lower Rhine, was inhabited principally by Celtic tribes, though some Germans had passed the Rhine, and either mixed with the natives, or formed a separate people. But the proper Belgic Gauls in general, under whatsoever name distinguished, used the Celtic language, religion, and manners, with some variations, derived from lapse of time, and local circumstances.

" Different tribes emigrated, at different periods, from the Coasts of Gaul to Britain; but none, who may have quitted any part of the Coast of Gaul, between the Rhine and the Pyrenees, before the time of Cæsar, were Gothic, or German; and therefore the Belgæ of Britain were Celts, not Goths, though they might differ from the prior inhabitants in dialect and manners.

" 7. There is no authority to prove that the ancient Scythians were Goths, and still less to shew they were a distinct specific people, using a common language, and uniformly following the same customs.

" 8. The people called Gothic, do not appear to have overspread the greater part of Europe till a later period, even of the Roman Empire.

" 9. The country called Germany itself, was not, in the time of Tacitus, wholly occupied by German or Gothic tribes; but was also peopled partly with Celtic and Sarmatic hordes. And even those tribes called German, differed essentially among themselves in religion, manners, and government.

" 10. The Germans, under any denomination whatever, had not passed the Rhine, and peopled the greater part of Gaul, till even long posterior to the time of Cæsar."

Before we conclude, we have to remark, that the writer of the Vindication, though evidently a Celt, has not been provoked by the

ferocious Goth who attacks his progenitors, to return railing for railing; but proceeds to investigate the truth with coolness and sobriety.

A list of words in the Greek and Welsh languages, in which a similarity is discernible, is annexed in an Appendix.

Charles Ellis: or, The Friends; a Novel, comprising the Incidents and Observations occurring on a Voyage to the Brazils and West Indies, actually performed by the Writer, Robert Semple: Author of "Walks and Sketches at the Cape of Good Hope." 2 vols. 12mo. Pp. 506. 9s. Baldwins. 1806.

MR. SEMPLE states himself to be a young merchant, and seems to think that some apology is therefore necessary for the attempt of a person engaged in mercantile pursuits to write a novel. Now, on this point, we beg leave to differ from him;—if his novel be a good one, no apology can be necessary; if a bad one, no apology will avail. In short, it is nothing to the reader whether the author be a merchant, *un homme de lettres*, or a garretteer;—whether he be a Brewer or a Cabinet Minister; but it is something to him, whether the man who writes a book which he *purchases* be qualified for the task or not; and whether the production so purchased be instructive and amusing, or stupid and insipid. Having premised this, on the necessity of an apology, we must now admit, that as Mr. Semple chose to make an apology, he could not well have made a better.

"My apology," he says in his Preface, "is briefly this—that I see no reason, because the daily avocations of any class of men are the same, that their amusements should also be similar. Perhaps, my good friend"—(addressing himself to the 'gentle reader,' we suppose)—"you are a very industrious, plodding, thriving member of society"—(Alas! we fear that your industrious, plodding, thriving folks, never read novels, and therefore this address will be thrown away);—"but you have your hours of relaxation; you smoke your pipe, or you drink your wine; or you mount your horse or your gig"—(Oh fie! a plodding, thriving man in a *gig!* what an anomaly!);—"or you go to Sadler's-wells, or perhaps the Opera"—(The *Opera!* worse and worse!).—"Very well, then; during the hours you were there, I wrote the History of Charles Ellis."

Now that it is better to be a novel-writer than a debauchee, *may* be true; but that depends on the kind of novels which a man writes; because some novels prove the author to be a debauchee, and, still worse, tend to make others resemble him. Not so, however, Charles Ellis; and certainly Mr. Semple was much better employed in composing his History, than he would have been in passing his evenings like *Young Wilding*, in the *Citizen*. Indeed, to say the truth, we have not, for many a day, read a *novel* which has so much that is good, and so little that is exceptionable, in it.

The

The hero, Charles Ellis, is the son of a merchant, who, having met with crosses in business, forsakes the metropolis at the age of thirty-five, and retires, with his wife, then pregnant, to a small paternal estate in a sequestered valley, terminated by the sea, in Cumberland. Among the inhabitants of this vale was a Mr. Wilson, a low illiterate tradesman, who had also retired from business with an independence of 300l. a year; an old seaman, Captain Seabold, who had some of the eccentricities, and all the good qualities, so generally and so justly ascribed to his profession; a Mr. Williamson, the parish priest, who was such as every parish priest ought to be; and a gentleman, whom the author sneeringly denominates John Berkeley, Esquire, "a man of a very ancient family, and who, indeed, took no merit to himself on any one account, except that of his descent. For upwards of two hundred years, the little estate of Kerwood had descended from father to son in the Berkeley family," and much longer according to their own private documents. Now we object exceedingly to the attempt to hold up such a character to derision. We are not to be told,

"Et genus et proavos, et quæ non fecimus ipsi,
Vix ea nostra voco———;"

for though it would be the height of presumption, as well as of absurdity, to impute the merits of our progenitors to ourselves; yet the pride of ancestry ought not to be an object of senseless ridicule, since it is the parent of many noble feelings and excellent virtues; it generates a spirit of emulation; it operates as an incentive to generous deeds; it leads the mind to imitate the qualities which it admires, the merit which it records. The circumstance of living on the same spot on which his ancestors had lived for centuries, is, to any man, a just and honourable ground of exultation; and so long as his own conduct does not reflect discredit on his forefathers, he may fairly be allowed to boast of it. Berkeley is not represented as a vicious or a dishonourable man; in no respect does he disgrace his ancestors; and the mere act "of taking no merit to himself," is a proof that he possessed great merit. While the author's words, therefore, tend to render Berkeley ridiculous, his own sentiments and actions make him respectable. Berkeley appears to be a *Tory*, and Ellis a *Whig*.

Charles Ellis having attained his sixth year, his education became a matter of serious consideration; and his father, wishing to have the opinion of his friends on the subject, invited all the above-mentioned characters (except the only one competent to give a good opinion on it, the Clergyman) to dinner, for the express purpose of asking their advice, with a predetermination, however, to follow his own. He was rightly served, for all his attempts after dinner to fix the subject of conversation to the point to which he wished to draw it, proved fruitless; the tradesman, who *loved a joke*, told long stories; the seaman fought his battles o'er again; and the Tory engaged his host in a political conversation on *loyalty*, on which they disagreed; but which Berke-

ley, like a man of sense, terminated by observing, "At all events, we agree most cordially in affection to our present Sovereign, whose virtues are such as scarcely to entitle loyalty, merely considered as such, to any merit."—"We do, indeed," said Ellis; "and we will, if you please, drink long life and health to him, nor do I care if I never see another King on the Throne of England." We have said that Ellis appears to be a Whig; but justice demands a retractation of the assertion, for certainly such an observation as this would have produced his instantaneous expulsion from the Whig Club.

Foiled in his attempt to obtain the advice of his friends, he at length resolved to decide for himself; and, though a perfect freethinker, or rather, one of the very numerous sect of *Nothingarians*, he finally determined to entrust the education of his son to the Clergyman of the parish, who had a son of his own, nearly of the same age, and a daughter, somewhat younger. With this worthy priest, Charles Ellis remained till he had attained his twentieth year; when his father, having buried his wife, felt his commercial propensities return, and resolved to take his son to London with him. There he was introduced to a strange character, James Brown, who had been bred a tailor; but, having failed in business, and cheated his creditors, set up as a gentleman, with a capital of six or seven hundred pounds. He was also introduced to some other young men, of much the same stamp, who soon sapped the principles which he had imbibed under Mr. Williamson, and led him into scenes of dissipation and debauchery.

Considerable ability, and knowledge of human nature, are displayed in the delineation of this young man's character, feelings, and conduct. His slow and gradual progress from virtue to vice, after his arrival in town, is ably pourtrayed.

"But what, above all, tended to restore his spirits, was the introduction which his father procured for him to several young men of his own age, with whom he soon became very intimate. He was pleased with the easiness of their manners and conversation, so different from that of young rustics; and this mistaken idea of superiority unfortunately blinded his eyes to the vices which they gradually developed to him. He was shocked at first, it is true; but his surprise and sorrow were of no long duration. Every thing tended to accelerate his initiation in the vices of the metropolis; the eagerness of his new companions in instructing him—the generous warmth of his own disposition, of his temperament, and his time of life—and the connivance of his father, who was too much a man of the world not to rejoice at the progress which his son was daily making in getting rid of his native bashfulness, all contributed to impair his good resolutions. Before three months had elapsed, a material change had taken place in his external appearance for the better, and in his sentiments for the worse. He still professed to revere the Sabbath; but indulgence in innocent amusements on that day was surely no harm, and never meant to be restrained. Drunkenness was the most odious and beastly of vices; but to take a cheerful glass, and get merry with a few friends, was no disgrace. As for swearing, nothing could be more shocking

shocking—nothing more sinful, and, at the same time, more unprofitable, than profanity; yet surely, demme! sink me! zounds! and the like, could be no offence to Heaven. In a word, the young man was beginning to play with vice. It had always been represented to him as an object of horror; but he did not discover it when dressed in flowers; and he began very shrewdly to suspect, that the good Mr. Wilmington, in his eagerness for his welfare, had painted some indiscretions in too strong colours. With all this, however, he did not as yet entirely neglect his studies; he still repaired, at times, to the fountain-head of pure morality, and took occasional fits of virtuous resolution; for two or three days, shut up in his chamber, he renewed his acquaintance with his favourite authors; but his new companions never failed to call upon him with such astonishing anxiety, concerning his health, and the whole common-place routine of idle inquiries, that Charles considered them as the warmest and sincerest of friends; and, unable to refuse them any thing, generally finished by making one of their party in any scheme of pleasure. It was, however, in these moments of retirement that the thoughts of home pressed the most warmly on his mind; and the recollection of his youthful companions awoke emotions, which he soon discovered to be very different from those inspired by his new acquaintance."

Thus was reflection intercepted in its course, and our hero was hurried on from pleasure to pleasure.

"It cannot be supposed that a young man of such a temperament as Charles, had been transplanted from the activity and temperance of a country life to the luxury and comparative indolence of the metropolis, without feeling the effects of such a change. Instead of a diet chiefly vegetable, water to drink, and a hard mattrass to sleep on, he now ate daily of highly-seasoned dishes, drank freely of wine, and slept on a soft bed of down till long after the sun was up; but, above all, the conversation of his new friends tended to inflame his active, and hitherto untainted, imagination. At first he was shocked, and blushed at expressions and language which he daily heard; but this wore off, and he sometimes tremblingly hazarded witticisms which would have been strongly reprehended in his native valley, but which were passed unnoticed, or received with applause, by his new friends. It was now the eleventh day since he had received his letters—he was dining with a jovial party—and, for the first time in his life, got intoxicated. About eleven o'clock at night he sallied out, with an intention to repair directly home; but on his way, overtook one of those unfortunate women who infest the streets of all great cities, and who accosted him in a mild tone of voice, at the same time laying hold of his arm. Heated as he was with wine, the touch thrilled to his very heart, and he had not the resolution to shake her off; on the contrary, he conceived the benevolent and sagacious idea of reclaiming her from such an evil life, and began forthwith to exhort her with great warmth. The artful female encouraged the conversation, which soon took a very different turn:—but why should I multiply words? Even now I see him standing wavering in the street—I mark his flushed and feverish cheek, and his eyes beaming with a guilty pleasure.—Ah! stop Charles! stop, my boy!—it is thy preceptor, thy youthful companions, thy mother's shade, that call upon thee!—but they call in vain.

Whilst I yet speak, a white female arm, perfumed, and bound with a bracelet, is extended from a door half opened, and gently draws along the young man. He turns round, as if conscious of guilt, and fearful lest any person should behold him;—but it is in a silent and lonely court, where there are no passengers, and lighted only by a solitary lamp, which already begins to twinkle in its socket: his pulse beats high with youth and wine —he turns and casts one last look on virtue; then hurries over the polluted threshold, and the door instantly closes. Alas! poor Charles!"

This is fine painting. The author's admonitions on the subject are not less forcible.

"The pleasures of vice, if pleasures they can be called, are of short duration, and leave behind them the most painful remembrances. To the confirmed profligate, these remembrances act as inducements to plunge into fresh excesses, and to endeavour to drown them in a new delirium—but, with the novice in guilt, they produce a contrary effect, and seldom fail to be succeeded by a momentary enthusiasm in the cause of virtue. Young man preserve, I beseech you, these first impressions—they are the surest criterions of right and wrong, and are the least sophisticated of all our decisions respecting our own conduct. Whatever certain philosophers may talk of the calm and dispassionate investigation of our reason, rely upon it, that whatever the untainted heart condemns, the untainted judgment cannot approve."

Charles's remorse, his good resolutions, and his subsequent reformation, are strongly depicted. He resolves to write, at last, to his forsaken friends in the country, and has just finished his letter when Edward Williamson, the son of his tutor, enters his room in regimentals. This young man had obtained a commission in a marching regiment, and was preparing for his departure to the Continent. The two friends, however, were to pass some time together in London, during which Edward was to see every thing that was worthy of observation in the capital; among other places they visited Westminster Abbey, and, dining that day with a select party, the objects which they had contemplated in the morning became the subject of conversation.

"The master of the family turned to Edward, and asked him how he had been pleased that morning with Westminster Abbey? Doubtless to any other question the young soldier would have returned a plain and simple answer, but his mind being still full of enthusiasm on that subject, he replied, 'that he had been delighted, and never in his life before had experienced such feelings.' The warmth with which this was delivered greatly interested the company in his behalf; and, as it afforded a new topic of conversation, the Abbey, with its aisles and towers, the chapel with its curious roof, the tombs of our kings, and the monuments of our best men, soon became the subject of praise and criticism. The conversation grew doubly interesting—for how could men of literature and genius talk of such themes, without awakening a thousand recollections of patriotic actions, and immortal bards? By degrees, however, this

this enthusiasm subsided, and the taste and execution of these monuments were discussed. Some praised the sculpture of this figure, and some of that; but amidst all the remarks made, it was observed that neither Charles nor Edward spoke a word on this subject.—'I suppose,' said the host to Charles, 'you have no statues in your village churches, and that consequently you have but little knowledge of sculpture.'—'I must indeed be very ignorant on that point, or naturally of a bad taste,' replied Charles, 'for really several monuments that have been highly praised by these gentlemen, appear to me absurd in their very principles.'—'How so?' asked a Connoisseur, who had particularly distinguished himself by descanting on their various merits.—'Nay,' said Charles, 'I do not pretend to set up my judgment in opposition to what seems the general and approved taste of men who have made these subjects their study; but, I must confess, it appears to me absolutely ridiculous to see so many renowned Englishmen clothed in Roman garbs, and displaying their naked limbs, in direct opposition to the habits and manners, not only of the periods in which they lived, but of any nation in Europe for these several centuries past. My friend and I were puzzling our brains to find out a cause, or, to speak truly, an excuse for this taste; but, I must own, it was beyond our comprehension.'—'Very likely,' replied the Connoisseur, somewhat nettled, 'yet still there *are* reasons, which to men of talents have appeared sufficient to justify this practice.' As the company seemed to listen to this dispute without any of them interposing; after a short pause, Charles replied, 'I should be glad to hear them, Sir, if it is not too much trouble.'—'By no means,' said the other: 'In the first place, the Roman garb, both civil and military, is well calculated to shew the art of the sculptor, and the shape of the limbs. The *toga*, thrown in graceful folds over the shoulders, and round the body, is beyond doubt infinitely more elegant than the modern *coat*: and, on the other hand, the short military garb serves to shew the turn of the limbs, and enables the sculptor to display the swelling of the muscles to the greatest advantage; add to this, the ancient garb being now obsolete in real use, has become a sort of classical dress, which will be equally an invariable standard a thousand years hence, as it has been for these two centuries past: whereas our dress is perpetually varying, and a statue in the dress, even of our grandfathers, with long waistcoat flaps, high pocket-holes, huge wig and rapier, stockings rolled over the knee, and broad-toed shoes, would cut rather a ridiculous figure in Westminster Abbey.'—'Not so much so,' cried Charles, 'as an English Admiral in a Roman dress leaning upon a cannon, as in the monument of Admiral Holmes; or, as another brave seaman standing between two palm trees, with his left foot upon the *rostrum*, or beak of an ancient galley, as in that of Admiral Watson; or, General Wolfe, dying on the field of battle stark naked; or the monument of General Ligonier, in which battering rams are mixed with cannons and bombs, and muskets with shields, as ornaments and supporters. Such incongruities appeared both to my friend and myself as absolutely unpardonable, although, I must confess, your ingenious defence has rendered the custom somewhat more excusable in my eyes than it appeared this morning.' After thanking him for the compliment, as the company seemed still willing to hear more on the subject, by not interfering or changing the conversation, the gentleman went on:—'But you still have not weakened my objection to the statues of our great men being represented

with

with modern garbs, namely, the absurd appearance they may make a hundred years hence.'—'To tell you the truth, Sir,' replied Charles, 'your objection did not appear to me of any great weight. In the valley where I was born, lives a gentleman of very ancient family, and an intimate friend of my father, named Berkeley: amongst other portraits, he has one at full length of his great great grandfather, who was slain at the battle of Edge Hill, and notwithstanding he is represented strictly in the dress of those times, and such as would certainly be reckoned preposterous at the present day, I never saw a nobler countenance and figure; and certainly no person ever feels the smallest inclination to criticise his dress. Now, had this brave man been represented in marble, as on canvass, I cannot conceive any absurdity in the idea. On the contrary, as paintings are so much more perishable than statuary, I should wish to see our illustrious men represented in stone and marble with the dress they wore, even to the minutest article, when they performed the very actions for which their country has thought proper to honour them with memorials.'

" 'Recollect yourself a little, young gentleman,' replied the Connoisseur, 'you surely admit as legal the use which is made in English poetry of the heathen mythology and allusions. Perhaps *you* sometimes mount your Pegasus, wish to drink deep of the Pierian springs, or call upon the Muses to inspire you with bright ideas. Now, as such expressions and invocations are universally allowed in our writers, in like manner, I contend, that a latitude should be given to statuaries to dress their heroes as they please; and, if they do not chuse to give them a coat and breeches, why not shew them off in a *toga*, and no breeches at all?' This remark made the company laugh, which so pleased the Connoisseur, that he began to think his victory secure, and that Charles would have no more to say. The young man, however, joined in the laugh, and when it had subsided returned again to the charge. He contended, 'that Helicon, Parnassus, Pegasus, and the like, were mere words of course, borrowed from the ancients, and employed metaphorically, because we had no corresponding expressions in our language; but he affirmed, that it was not so with painting and sculpture, which were confined to representing objects as they really were, or might be supposed to be at the time. That Cato with—

'Long wig and lacquered chain,'

was not a whit more absurd than a modern European in the senatorial robes of Cato;' and, in short recapitulated what he had before advanced. As his antagonist had now nothing more to observe, the conversation would probably have terminated without being decided either way, had not another of the company repeated a remark on the stiffness of dress of a modern soldier, compared to that of the ancients. This, with other similar observations, by degrees roused Edward for the honour of his profession, of which, being young, he was a zealous supporter in all its branches. After sitting, therefore, full of impatience for a short time, he stretched out his hand, and addressing himself to the Connoisseur—'Sir,' said he, 'if the dress of an English soldier were a thousand times more ridiculous, when compared to that of a Roman, than it is, I still think that so many brave men have fought and bled in it, as to render it for ever honourable, and worthy of being transmitted to future ages. Surely, the uniform in which a Marlborough conquered, and a Wolfe fell, and which so many gallant officers are wearing at this moment, ought to be

no

no object of contempt to a chipper of marble! think how many brave heroes wore this uniform at Hochstet, Ramilies, and Oudenarde: at Minden, and even at Fontenoy, where they so dearly maintained its honour; and tell me, if ever Grecian or Roman garb was more ennobled? I need say nothing of our sea officers: if *their* dress be not worthy of the sculptor, where shall we seek one more so?' These observations, which were made in a most impetuous manner, were allowed to be conclusive on the subject, and judgment was passed *in toto* upon all English artists representing their countrymen in Roman dresses, which not only they never wore, but perhaps never saw.'

There is a great deal of good sense in these observations, however offensive they may prove to Connoisseurs, or to those who pretend to be such. We cannot follow our friends through their various adventures; Edward Williamson distinguishes himself on the Continent, is promoted, and killed. Charles Ellis accompanies his father to the different places mentioned in the title-page, of which some brief account is given, and, on his return to Europe, consigns him to a watery grave. He revisits his native valley, marries the daughter of old Seabold, and settles there for life.

The language, as our readers must have seen from our extracts, is correct; the style plain and perspicuous; the characters are well drawn, and ably sustained; the incidents are natural, and the sentiments, principles, and moral are good. In short, the work is greatly superior to the generality of modern novels; and, in all respects, creditable to the talents and feelings of the author.

Travels, after the Peace of Amiens, through Parts of France, Switzerland, Italy, and Germany. By J. G. Lemaistre, Esq. Author of a "Rough Sketch of Modern Paris." 8vo. 3 vols. Pp. 1295. 1l. 11s. 6d. Johnson. 1806.

MR. LEMAISTRE is an indefatigable tourist; and can, when he pleases, be lively and pleasant, though it does not often please him to be so. It has, however, become a custom, which it behoves us to notice, for men who fancy they have ability to write for the instruction of the public, to make *speculative tours*; that is, tours for the express purpose of collecting materials for the press, with a view to profit. Whether this be the case with Mr. Lemaistre, we shall not presume to decide; but certain it is, that he understands the art of *book-making* as well as any professional tourist of the whole tribe. Had he condensed his observations, reflections, and *catalogues*, into a single volume in twelves, he might have easily contrived to render it both amusing and instructive; but as it is, he has so completely reversed the rule of *multum in parvo*, talks so much about his lady and himself, and appears to suffer his opinions of a place and its inhabitants to be so much biassed by the reception which he experiences,

the

the dinners which he eats, and the balls which he frequents, that the rational reader becomes disgusted, and throws by the book. Unhappily, whatever disgust poor critics may feel, however disposed they may be to throw down a book, their duty compels them to subdue their feelings, and to persevere, until their eyes shall hail that welcome signal of repose—FINIS.

The work is dedicated, by *permission*, to the Prince of Wales, who is hailed, in all the *modest* language of dedication, as "an English Mæcenas." The Prince, however, is certainly entitled to great praise for his munificence, in sending an English gentleman, at his own expence, to Portici, to *unfold* the ancient manuscripts found in the ruins of Herculaneum; a task which had been relinquished by the King of Naples from dire necessity. This is a princely action, of which no one can speak without commendation; but when Mr. Lemaistre determined to tell the world, that the Prince's "generous support of the constitutional liberties of his country, had, from my earliest years, excited my veneration and respect," it assuredly became him to specify the instances in which that support had been manifested. As it is, a Cynic may possibly be disposed to apply to his observation the cant expression of Burchell, in the Vicar of Wakefield. As to "that general fame which is the necessary concomitant and just reward of public virtue," Mr. Lemaistre's stock of classical knowledge, which he displays without mercy, and of which he boasts without scruple, upon all occasions, will supply him with the true character of *Fame*, without any assistance from us; and should, we think, have taught him by *what* means it is often acquired, and *what* value ought to be placed upon it.

The author pursued his way from France to Switzerland through Paris, Dijon, and Lyons. When in Switzerland, he made excursions to the Glaciers, and to different parts of that interesting country which he deemed most worthy his attention. Thence he went from Lausanne, by Meudon, Aix, St. Jean de Maurienne, and Mont Cenis, to Italy. He visited Turin, Genoa, Milan, Piacenza, Parma, Modena, Bologna, Rome, and Naples. From the last city he returned to Rome, and then proceeded, by Ferrara and Padua, to Venice. From Venice he went to Vienna, thence to Berlin, and from Berlin, through Lubeck, to Tonningen, where he embarked for England. We shall not be expected to follow him from place to place through the whole of this extensive Tour, nor yet to notice all his desultory observations on the works of Nature and of Art. We can only stop with him here and there, where the entertainment appears inviting, or where something occurs to call for our animadversions. Dijon, we are told, is rendered *so celebrated* "by being the spot where the great army of reserve, before the second expedition to Italy, was assembled;"—a silly remark, which had better been omitted—if that city was celebrated for nothing else, it was not worthy of notice. At Lyons, Mr. Lemaistre visited the Town-house, and took the trouble of copying a lying inscription, in which the *virtues*

of

of the murderer of Jaffa are recorded. He is there called "the Conqueror of Europe," of which, in the estimation of his slaves, Great Britain and Ireland, of course, form no part; and it is added, with equal *truth*, that "at sight of him, the arts revived in this city, and commerce was restored to its ancient splendour." When it is notorious that he, and his brother regicides, caused all the monuments of the arts to be demolished, and ruined the trade of Lyons, which has never, to this moment, been restored. The tourist who thought proper to transplant this compilation of falshoods into his pages, should, at least, have submitted to the trouble of pointing them out to his readers. Of the disposition of the inhabitants, our traveller, short as his stay was at Lyons, seems to have acquired a pretty correct notion.

"From the heavy losses which the town has experienced, from the devastation committed on its principal buildings, and from the murder of its best and richest citizens, Lyons derives a strong and rooted hatred to the name of Republic; and, however satisfied the inhabitants may be with the Government of Buonaparte, their satisfaction is only relative (comparative). They prefer his administration to any which has existed since the death of Louis XVI.; but they are still royalists; and if the House of Bourbon shall, in the course of years, be *ever* restored, I am convinced that no part of France will so heartily rejoice in the measure, or so willingly assist in promoting it, as the city of Lyons."

On his arrival at Geneva, the author found the inhabitants displaying the most unequivocal marks of attachment to their former Government, and entertaining a rooted hatred of their tyrannical conquerors. They seldom go to the theatre, which the French have erected; and when they do go, the ladies always prefer the pit, that they may not be subjected to the impertinence of the French officers, who are, beyond all comparison, the most ignorant and the most disgusting animals in the whole creation. Mr. Lemaistre, indeed, who presumes to know much better than the Genevese themselves, asserts, without hesitation, that "the military behave themselves with the greatest propriety;" but we must express our utter disbelief of the fact. He adds, however, that "none are received in the houses of the principal citizens;" which is to us, added to our own knowledge of the character and conduct of the subalterns of a French army, a convincing proof, that the author has either formed an hasty and unwarrantable opinion of his own, or that he has been egregiously imposed upon.

Mr. Lemaistre further observes, in respect of Geneva, that "the aristocratic distinctions which existed in the time of the Republic, are still scrupulously observed in the choice and divisions of society, and prove to demonstration, that manners, customs, and prejudices, are above the power of law." Indeed! And did this traveller, in his journey through *France*, really find no difference in the *manners*, *customs*, and *prejudices* of the people, since the Revolution? If he did not, we shall venture to say, that he either closed his eyes and ears, or that his observations were very limited and superficial. One of the prevailing

prevailing customs at Geneva is so singular, and, as we believe, peculiar to that city, that we shall extract our author's brief account of it.

"While on the subject of society, I ought to mention another ancient usage which is still observed, and which is highly worthy of commendation. The daughters of the Genevese are, from their earliest years, formed into circles of fourteen or fifteen, of corresponding ages, selected by their respective mothers from among the children of their friends. The young ladies constituting such circle, or party, meet on every Sunday evening at the house of one of their parents—each mother receiving in her turn the friends of her daughter, and giving them tea, fruit, ices, and other such refreshments. They amuse themselves in their little assemblies with the innocent gambols suited to their age, with work, music, dancing, and confidential conversation. No man, however nearly related to any of them, is admitted into these parties till one of the members is married. As soon as this event takes place, she who has changed her situation becomes the *chaperon(ne)* of her former associates; and, under her auspices, single gentlemen are received in the Sunday *coteries* of the female friends, till by degrees the others become as fortunate as their introductress. Nor does their union end here: the attachments of early youth are not easily eradicated. In maturer years, those habits of intimacy which were contracted in infancy are continued; and the married women of Geneva generally spend their lives in the society of those who were the companions and playfellows of their girlish days. The children of these, form in their turn a similar circle; and it is no uncommon thing to see a party of females, whose hereditary union may thus be traced for many centuries.

"This institution, as a bond of friendship, and a source of happiness, cannot be too highly praised. Perhaps, too, such an establishment may, in no small degree, contribute to that propriety of manner, and decency of conduct, which distinguish the ladies of Geneva. She must be both weak and abandoned who, for any momentary gratification, would forfeit the good opinion of her friends, and the innumerable advantages which are enjoyed by a member of a society so constituted. Meeting every week under the eye of one of their parents, the females of Geneva have constantly instilled into their minds the principles of virtue; while each individual becomes, as it were, the guardian of the hono*(u)*r of her associates."

That such an institution may be (and, no doubt, *is*, at Geneva) productive of good effects, we are not disposed to deny; but we cannot see what stronger inducement to the observance of a virtuous conduct it can afford, than is holden out in other well-regulated societies, where the inculcation of religious principles is duly attended to.—When a woman strays from the paths of virtue, she is as much discarded from society in England as at Geneva;—with *one* or *two* exceptions, indeed, which only serve to strengthen the rule.

In his excursions round Geneva, Mr. Lemaistre could not fail to visit Ferney, the former residence of the arch-fiend Voltaire. His account of this place exceeds, in point of puerility and absurdity, any thing

thing of the kind which we have ever read. He gives us a laboured description of every apartment, the prints which it contains, inscriptions, &c. &c. The estate has reverted to the descendants of its original proprietors, who shewed every part of it to our traveller with the greatest politeness; but Mr. Lemaistre was so lost in his admiration of Voltaire, that he could not look with patience on a tree that was not planted, or on a room that was not furnished, by that *philosopher*, as *he* calls him, or *philosophist*, as *we* should call him. He assures us, that

"The whole place, though sufficient for every purpose of convenience and sociability, has nothing in it which would excite attention, if the genius of Voltaire had not scattered over this little domain a degree of interest which the finest efforts of architecture would scarcely command. It is, indeed, one of the privileges of *exalted minds*, to dignify the inanimate objects which once belonged to them. *Travellers with warm feelings and literary taste*, will never fail to visit with pleasure the *château* of Ferney, or the much humbler residence of our immortal Shakspeare, whose mulberry-tree receives in its decay more votaries than the proudest temples of antiquity."

Passing over the last part of this sentence, which is mighty pretty, and wants nothing but *truth* to recommend it; and also the insult offered to our favourite bard, by coupling his name with that of the man who *libelled*, because he could not *understand*, him; we shall take leave to tell Mr. Lemaistre, that a traveller of *proper feelings* would experience very different sensations from those of admiration and pleasure, on visiting that deadly spot, on which the veriest miscreant that ever devoted extraordinary talents to the basest of purposes, planned the infernal scheme of subverting the Christian faith; of overthrowing the altars of Christ;—a wretch who (we shudder while we repeat his enormities) stigmatised the blessed Redeemer of the human race as *infamous*, and his holy Apostles as "twelve scoundrels!" —Do *warm feelings* and *literary taste* tend to suppress the indignation which every religious, every virtuous, every honest mind must, we should suppose, experience on contemplating the residence of such a monster? Or are *genius* and *exalted minds*—such as we know Voltaire to have possessed—sufficient to make us bury in oblivion the most horrible perversion of the one, and the most abominable profligacy of the other?—Do *talents*, in the opinion of our tourist, atone for *crimes*? He must either answer these questions in the affirmative, or pronounce his own condemnation, for the senseless eulogies which he has bestowed on this base libeller of his God. Let Mr. Lemaistre impress his mind with this truth, which we have often endeavoured to enforce, that genius and talents, being the gift of God, imply no merit in those who possess them: and that it is only the wise and proper use and application of them that can entitle them to the approbation of the world. If our Traveller thus seek to varnish over crimes, or, at least, to subdue our reprobation of them, by calling on us to admire

admire the genius by which they were committed, it would be much better for society that he should either remain at home, or keep the information which he derives from his tours to himself.

At Lausanne, Mr. Lemaistre visited the former residence of Gibbon, the historian, of whom he collected the following anecdotes:

"Soon after he became an inhabitant of Lausanne, a lady of beauty and talents made such an impression on the heart of the historian, that he could not resist the impulse of love; and, falling on his knees, he declared his passion. The object of his affection heard unmoved his petition, and, in spite of the eloquence of her lover, was deaf to his entreaties. The disappointed *Damon* attempted to rise: he tried in vain: his weighty person, unaccustomed to such a position, was not so easily restored to its proper balance. The lady, fearing that some person might discover her admirer in this awkward situation, forgot her anger, and endeavoured with all her might to raise him from the ground: her strength was unequal to the task; and, after several ineffectual struggles both in the author and the lady, the latter was obliged to ring the bell, and to order her astonished servant to raise the prostrate scholar. The story, as might be expected, became public the following morning, and entertained for some days the gossiping circles of this little town.

"But notwithstanding the general esteem which Mr. Gibbon entertained for the fair sex, and notwithstanding this striking proof of daring gallantry, I have been assured by a person who enjoyed the confidence of that distinguished man, that the historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, though he has frequently described in glowing colours, and perhaps in some passages with lascivious freedom, the passion of love, was a stranger to its pleasures, and that he passed his life in a state of singular and rigid chastity.

"Another story, though of a different kind, is equally characteristic. Mr. Gibbon, finding himself indisposed, sent for a physician. The doctor, judging from the appearance of his patient that his illness, which was but slight, simply arose from repletion, recommended abstinence. Three days afterwards he received a letter from the historian, couched in pressing terms, but still in well-rounded sentences, requiring his immediate presence at his house. On his arrival there, he found Mr. Gibbon dreadfully altered: his cheeks, usually plump, had now fallen; his complexion sallow, and his person emaciated. The physician anxiously inquired the cause of this sudden and unexpected change. 'Sir,' said his learned patient, 'to follow with religious exactitude the ordinances of him whom I consult as my medical adviser, is a principle from which I have never yet ventured to depart; but at this instant I am the victim of obedience, and of a doctrine which I still believe to be generally salutary. You will recollect, Sir, that when last I had the honour of seeing you, you admonished me to abstain from animal food. Three days have elapsed since I received your injunctions; and during that period, the only food which has passed these lips, has been a beverage of water-gruel: I have consequently become languid; and am now desirous of a more nutritious aliment; but presuming not to interfere in a science which I do not understand, and having placed the direction of my health under the guidance of your professional skill, I have awaited, I will not say without impatience,

the

the repetition of your visit: I now attend your orders.' The physician, who had not called during this interval, simply because he conceived Mr. Gibbon had no occasion for further advice, now rang the bell, and, instead of writing a prescription, ordered dinner to be instantly served. A good *bouillon*, and a bottle of Burgundy, soon restored the historian to health and spirits.

"The same physician advised Mr. Gibbon to take occasionally a dose of medicine. The obedient scholar, adopting with literal precision the system recommended, wrote immediately a Latin letter to his apothecary, directing that on the first of every month such a draught should be sent him as Dr. ——— should direct: and accordingly, at such stated period during the rest of his life, whether he were well or ill, he received and swallowed the accustomed dose."

In his tour through Switzerland, our Traveller observes, on his entrance into the canton of Lucerne, that "the poverty and dirt of the inhabitants marked the limits, and would have proved our arrival in a Catholic country, without the crosses, churches, and burying-grounds, covered with colo*(u)*red crucifixes, which we met with at every mile."

And, in a note, he adds:

"I have certainly no prejudices on religious subjects; but in travelling in Switzerland, it is impossible not to remark the wide difference in the appearance of the Catholic and (of the) Protestant districts. In the former, dirt, misery, and idleness, present themselves on all sides; and in the latter, cleanliness, good order, high cultivation, and decent manners."

We have extracted this fact, for the purpose of shewing the justice of our own observations (in our Review of Mr. Carr's "Stranger in Ireland") on the cause of the wretchedness of the lower classes in Ireland. *There*, as in the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, "dirt, misery, and idleness," prevail. The source of this wretchedness is the same in both countries;—it is to be found in the influence and the power of the priests, and in the *use* which they make of them.

At Turin, our Traveller took a view of the palace of the Sardinian Monarch, now, alas! occupied by the regicide Jourdan!

"The King's private apartment, as likewise the Queen's, we were refused the permission of seeing, because General Jourdan occupied the former, and his wife, who was expected from Paris the same night, intended lodging in the latter. 'Alas!' said our conductor, with a sigh of regret, 'it was very different formerly: our good King, instead of denying leave to see his rooms, took great pleasure in shewing the palace himself to strangers.—*Mais ces parvenus*—.' Here prudence stopped the conclusion of his sentence, and he changed the subject by pointing out another object to our attention."

He thus sums up his account of this capital:

"I can only say that it is a well-built, regular, handsome city; that it stands in a fine country, and must, while it enjoyed its national inde-

pendence, have been an agreeable residence. It has now lost its native Princes, and its most wealthy inhabitants. There is no industry, because there is no commerce, and consequently, no spirit or activity among the citizens. Idleness, dirt, poverty, and superstition, mark the appearance of the people; who pass their lives in lounging about the streets, or in crouding the numerous churches, which are constantly open."

Passing near the village of Marengo, Mr. Lemaistre tells us, that from the accounts which he collected on the spot, the Austrian army, in the battle fought at that place, consisted of 120,000 men, and that of the French of only 60,000; and that the fate of the battle was decided by the arrival of Buonaparte from Tortona, with the Consular guard, which acted as a *corps de reserve*. Now there happens not to be one syllable of truth in this account; and why Mr. Lemaistre, who asserts that he does not even *pretend to give an opinion*, should think it worth his while to repeat these idle tales of the Italian rustics, except, indeed, for the purpose of swelling his book, we cannot conceive. The two armies, at the battle of Marengo, are known to have been nearly equal in numbers; Buonaparte, who commanded the French, had actually lost the battle, late in the afternoon; and when Desaix went up to him, to point out a manœuvre which had suggested itself to his mind, he found Buonaparte (who had then actually ordered the retreat to be sounded) in such confusion that he could scarcely give him an answer; and all the orders Desaix received from him was, to do as he pleased. Desaix, accordingly, carried his plan into effect, restored the fortune of the day, and lost his life in the attempt. Buonaparte had no more merit in gaining that victory than Mr. Lemaistre himself.

Our author reached Parma soon after the death of the Prince, who was generally supposed to have been poisoned by the French. But he thought himself "bound, in common charity, to disbelieve the whole story," because "neither the person who administered the deadly potion, nor the manner in which it was given, nor the effects by which it generally shews itself, did any one attempt to demonstrate." Our readers will probably think these very silly reasons for refusing belief to the fact; since the circumstances which are here thought necessary to secure it, are generally too well concealed to become the subjects of public notice. But, in a note, written at a subsequent period, he says:

"This letter was of course written long before the murder of the Duke D'Enghien. After the conduct of Buonaparte on that occasion, one might, without much injustice, be inclined to suspect him, on very slight evidence, of crimes the most enormous; but as at the time when the Duke of Parma died"—(in the summer, we believe, of 1802),—"*he had not given any indisputable proofs of a sanguinary disposition*, I conceived the reasoning on which I acquitted him of the supposed murder of that Prince was fully justified."

The subsequent murder of the Duc D'Enghien can have no possible effect

effect on the previous reasons assigned by Mr. Lemaistre for his disbelief of the murder of the Duke of Parma; those reasons, which we have quoted above, having no reference whatever to the *disposition* of Buonaparte. They consisted merely in the absence of such circumstantial proofs as, in *his* opinion, were necessary to justify his belief of the fact; and assuredly some of these proofs were supplied by the midnight assassination in the wood of Vincennes. But, in the name of common sense let us ask, whether Mr. Lemaistre had been sleeping for twelve or fourteen years antecedent to this period? For, if he had been awake, he certainly could never have seriously advanced so preposterous an assertion, belied by the knowledge of every man in France, that, previous to the summer of 1802, Buonaparte had never given any indisputable proofs of a sanguinary disposition. Did Mr. Lemaistre never hear of *Paris*, of *Toulon*, of *Tanasco*, of *Jaffa*, of *Acra*? But we should as soon think of sitting down to *prove* that we derive light from the sun, as to deduce specific facts in order to demonstrate the sanguinary disposition of Buonaparte. If Mr. Lemaistre really want information on this subject, let him consult the pages of the Moniteur, or the published speeches of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Windham. If such a remark did not arise from ignorance, it could only proceed from a desire of misrepresentation, of which we should be sorry indeed to suspect our author.

Of the new Queen of Etruria (daughter to the King of Spain), who is represented as "a very amiable and worthy Princess," an anecdote is here recorded, which redounds so much to her honour, that it would be the height of injustice not to promote its circulation as far as we can.

"Every English reader will join in these praises, when it is mentioned, that she refused, after the late declaration of war, to comply with the demand of France, in issuing a proclamation, as regent, for the arrest of such British subjects as might be found in her dominions. 'France,' said this virtuous Princess, 'may by force execute this act of tyranny, but I will not lend my name to a measure of cruelty and injustice.'"

We have a most ridiculous account of the public appearance of the Pope in his capital.

"We soon saw a shabby old coach appear, in which his Holiness was seated, drawn by four horses of lean and wretched figure. ..... The servants and the guards of the Pope were at once so shabbily, and so ridiculously dressed, that I could easily have mistaken them for the attendants of Punch in a pantomime. The livery of the servants was old-fashioned and grotesque; and the uniform of the guards, yellow and black, with stockings of the same party colo(u)rs classed alternately. This uniform, tattered and dirty of its kind, was made in the shape of our beef-eaters' dresses at St. James's."

This is a woeful figure for that Pontiff to make who erst forced all the potentates of Europe to tremble at the thunders of the Vatican;

who gave laws to the Continent; and who laboured to usurp the sovereignty of Christendom.

Our author speaks with great discontent, and even disgust, of the Neapolitans, of both sexes. His account of them certainly differs from others which we have read or heard, but still it may be accurate for any thing that we know; and possibly the Revolution may have occasioned the difference. He records two extraordinary instances of ignorance, in persons of rank in Naples.

"A Duchess, whom I have seen, and who possesses one of the most splendid palaces in Naples, asked a friend of mine, who was lately a member of the House of Commons, why we kept such late hours in England, and particularly why we dined when it was almost time to sup. Mr. ——— answered, that one principal cause of that custom arose from the sittings of Parliament, which many gentlemen were obliged to attend*. 'Le Parlement,' interrupted the lady, for she could speak a few words of French; 'qu'est-ce que c'est que le Parlement? est-ce une promenade†, un corso? Je n'ai jamais entendu parler de cet endroit-là.'

"The other anecdote is this. 'During the late war, a Neapolitan *Marquis* came into the box of a foreign Minister at the theatre of San Carlos, and asked his Excellency if he had heard the news which had just arrived. Being answered in the negative, he continued, with a tone of impatience, 'Sir, the English fleet have blockaded Mantua!' The Ambassador smiled. 'You don't believe me?' rejoined the Neapolitan; 'my authority is indisputable: I received the intelligence from the King himself.'

"Innumerable other instances might be given of the ignorance‡ of the nobles;

---

* It was strange that the author's friend should have assigned a cause so partial for a custom so general. In fact, we believe, that the attendance in Parliament (seldom affecting more than 500 families in the metropolis) had no share whatever in producing this custom. It more probably proceeded, partly from the predominant influence of the goddess of caprice, ycleped *Fashion*; and, partly, from the radical change which has taken place within the last twenty years, in the habits and manners of the mercantile world.—Rev.

† The author has found it necessary to translate this *difficult* passage in a note; but his knowledge of the English language supplied him with no word to explain the French *promenade*; forgetting, no doubt, that there was such a substantive as *walk* in our Dictionary. This contemptible affectation of unnecessarily introducing French expressions, pervades the whole work, and cannot fail to disgust every reader of taste or sense.

‡ Mr. Lemaistre must pardon us for observing, that we do not think the superiority of his own understanding or acquirements sufficiently manifest to justify his dogmatical decisions on the ignorance of others. We wonder that the mention of the *Parliament* did not bring to his mind one or two proofs of *ignorance* which have been exhibited on *this side of the Alps*. He might have recollected a memorable exemplification of Blackstone's doctrine of Parliamentary *omnipotence*, in the transfer of a portion of

nobles; but after such specimens, it would be idle to repeat them. To take the Parliament of England for the Rotten-row of Hyde Park, and to make a sea-port of Mantua, are tolerable proofs of the little progress here made, in the acquirement of that general kind of knowledge which is dispersed through all societies in countries on the other side of the Alps.

Gross as this ignorance is, we have witnessed ignorance full as gross, and still more inexcusable, in France. Our readers will perhaps be induced to think, when they read the following passage, that, in his description of the Neapolitans, our author's pen was occasionally guided by *prejudice:*

"The Court, or company round the table was numerous, and formed a complete mob; and, though I am persuaded that the noblest blood in Europe flowed in the veins of the dukes, princes, and marquisses, assembled on the occasion, they had very much the appearance of strolling actors, prepared to represent the heroes of tragedy, or of footmen in the cast-off dresses of their masters. Their coats were laced and spangled all over; their hair was frizzed, and powdered to vie with the colo*(u)*r of snow; and many of them had ribbands, stars, and chamberlains' keys; yet there was a meanness in their persons and manners, which destroyed all the effect of their tawdry ornaments, and only rendered them doubly ridiculous. I looked with pride on the dignified simplicity of my young countrymen, who, in their plain cloth coats, or *manly* uniforms, looked like superior beings, when contrasted with these pigmy nobles, in spite of their gold, their velvet, their orders, and their grimaces."

There is, in this passage, something more than prejudice; truth compels us to say, that it is marked with illiberality, insult, and impertinence. It is somewhat strange that it should not have occurred to the author, that what appeared to him to be *dignified simplicity*, might be considered by the Neapolitans as *disgraceful meanness*; and that he and his countrymen might be as *ridiculous* in *their* eyes, as they were in *his*. If a foreigner, of any country, had assumed this tone of superiority, in speaking of Englishmen, Mr. Lemaistre would have been one of the first to reprove him for his vanity and insolence. We know no stronger proof of ignorance, than to adopt our own customs and manners as the criterion by which those of all other countries are to be estimated; and it is something worse than illiberality to repay politeness, civility, and attention, by ridicule, abuse and derision.—The passage, too, which we have quoted, is as silly as it is mischievous; for it is not very easy to conceive what likeness the Neapolitan nobles, in their court-dresses, which are represented as covered with gold and spangles, ribbands, and orders, could possibly bear to "footmen in the *cast off* dresses of their masters." We have said

---

of *Africa*, by an Act of Parliament, to *Europe*; and also, a notable instance of ministerial knowledge, in the conversion of part of a *Continent* into an *Island*.

that the passage, though silly, is *mischievous*; it is so far mischievous, that, if the book should be read on the Continent (which, indeed, is not very probable) the effect of it would be to procure a very cool reception, indeed, for such of our countrymen as should hereafter visit the Court of Naples. In *summing up* his account of Naples, the author gives us the following information.

"Of literature, it would be presumptuous in me to give an opinion. My stay has been so short, and my time has been so devoted to other pursuits, that it has been impossible for me to inquire into the state of learning in this city. I am inclined to think that few, if any, of the nobility seek for amusement in the cultivation of letters; and, though such a remark must be taken with many exceptions, it seems probable that well-informed persons are rarely found in the first classes of society. I have no doubt that, among the professors, medical men, lawyers, and clergy, there must be here, as every where else, many individuals of scientific and general knowledge, and whose acquirements would render them very valuable companions; but, circumscribed as I am in time, it is out of my power to seek their acquaintance."

We should really have imagined, that the state of literature would have been one of the first objects of inquiry and attention to a traveller of "literary taste," such as Mr. Lemaistre repeatedly pronounces himself to be; but our readers may form a competent notion from this specimen, of the nature and value of that information which they may expect to derive from a perusal of these volumes. He observes, that his stay in Naples had been so short as to preclude him from making any inquiries of this description; but he remained in that city two months, and if he had devoted some portion of that time, which he appears to have allotted to the society of persons whom he despised, to literary characters, he might have enabled himself to give *some* information on the subject; as it is, he has said no more than what he might have said, with equal propriety, if he had never stirred from his own fire-side.

His account of the Roman ladies is still less favourable than that of the Neapolitans. Of their *manners* he mentions the following instance, which occurred in his own presence, in the public gardens of the Villa Borghese.

"One of the prettiest women here, who lives in the first class of society, pretending to be angry with her *cavaliere servante*, desired an English gentleman, who happened to be of the party, to lift *the former* (him) on his back; and when he was thus placed in the attitude, which at Westminster and Eton schools *precedes* the usual discipline" (not only *precedes* but *accompanies*, we should suppose), "she took a whip in her hand, and administered a flogging in proper form. There were several of our countrywomen present, who viewed this ceremony with equal astonishment and disgust; while the Italian ladies laughed, and seemed to think this practical wit extremely entertaining."

Speaking of the last venerable Pontiff, Pius VIth, the author tells

us

us, that the accounts which he received of him from different persons, who had equal opportunities of knowing him well, were totally contradictory. One assured him that his piety was affected, that he was a drunkard, a spendthrift, a glutton, and a debauchee; and that a countess was named to him, who had long been his Holiness's kept mistress; while the other denied all these alleged facts, and asserted the perfect purity of his character. Mr. L. thinks, that the truth lay (as usual) between the two extremes; but he had evidently no ground for the formation of such an opinion; and as all that we ever heard of that Pontiff contradicts the account given by the republican, who insisted on his profligacy, we are disposed to believe him to have been a truly virtuous and good man.

Of the successor of Pius VI. we have the following account:

"Though esteemed as a man, for his many virtues, the reigning Pope is neither much followed, nor much talked of. When he drives along the streets in his carriage, crowds do not flock to receive his benediction; and those who accidentally obtain, in passing, that favo(u)r, appear not to be particularly sensible of its value. In short, I much doubt, whether, even in this city, the infallibility of his Holiness is now confidently believed. I have sometimes discovered a smile on the countenances of persons of the lowest rank, when miracles and relics have been named; and the luxury and idleness of the Cardinals afford a frequent and favo(u)rite subject of merriment."

Having experienced a most flattering reception at Vienna, Mr. L. dwells with delight on the virtues and accomplishments of the House of Austria. He tells us, however, that the gallant Archduke Charles has a mortal antipathy to the English, for having led Austria into the first revolutionary war with France—which we very much doubt; and he thinks that the confinement of "La Fayette and his injured associates" (poor, innocent, inoffensive mortals!) is a drawback on the excellent character of the reigning Emperor. Had Mr. Lemaistre forgotten that this revolutionary coxcomb had been the voluntary gaoler of his injured Sovereigns and their family; that he had been a preacher of those fatal doctrines which had plunged thousands and tens of thousands into the horrors of imprisonment, and had consigned millions of innocent victims to an untimely grave? or, are his philanthropic feelings interested only for rebels and regicides? Curse on such whining philanthropy, which reserves all its tears for the guilty, and sees the innocent perish unmoved!

In a note our author mentions the following curious facts:

"A few weeks before, it seems, Buonaparte, at his public audience, asked the Minister of the Elector of Bavaria, what were the revenues of his master; and, on receiving a satisfactory answer, observed, 'they are just what I supposed them to be. The Electorate will afford a proper compensation to the Emperor of Austria for Venice and Trieste.' Not satisfied with thus insulting both these independent States, he next sent a message to the Emperor, requiring his presence in Italy, where he wished

to meet him. The Emperor civilly declined the invitation. 'What!' cried Buonaparte, in one of those fits of passion to which he is frequently subject, "does he refuse to come? Tell him, then, I will pay him a visit at Vienna, and will sleep in his bed.'"

We shall now leave our Tourist to pursue his way to England; having given our readers a sufficient insight into the merits and demerits of his production, the latter of which greatly preponderate.—The style, though occasionally easy, is often awkward and affected, and sometimes stiff and pedantic. The frequent introduction of French words and phrases, disgusts the English reader; all the substantives ending in *our*, derived from the Latin, such as honour, favour, &c. are, either from ignorance or affectation, written without the *u*; so that, in fact, the Latin words are substituted for the English. Grammatical inaccuracies, too, often occur. A few instances of improper language we have marked. In vol. i. p. 273, we are told of "*the second finest* church of Milan." In p. 285, we have the word *Marquisse*, which is neither French nor Italian. Vol. ii. p. 111, speaking of the Cardinal York, the last Prince of the hapless House of Stuart, Mr. Lemaistre observes, "instead of performing the high functions of *executive magistrate* in a great kingdom, he passes his time in the ceremonies of a church; and has changed" (what, be it observed, he never possessed), "a court of statesmen, *legislators*, and peers, for a conclave of friars, monks, and abbots.' We notice this passage, in order to censure the author for his adoption of the democratic cant, in calling the King of Great Britain, an *Executive Magistrate*; and some members of his Court, we know not who, *legislators*. It betrays a gross ignorance of the nature of the *sovereignty*, which involves the possession of supreme power, both executive and legislative. Is Mr. Lemaistre to be told, that it is the King who *makes* the law, which the two great councils of the nation *prepare* and *propose*, by his royal fiat, imperatively pronounced, *Le Roi le veut?* Such loose modes of expression, leading to errors of great consequence, should never pass without exposure and reproof. P. 266, "Every wrinkle *and* every hair *is* (are) distinctly marked." P. 318, the author talks of the "*unrivalled superiority*," of our countrywomen.—We do not well see how *superiority* can be *rivalled*. If one woman possesses greater charms than another, she has the undoubted *superiority* in that respect; but, if her charms are successfully *rivalled* by those of another, she has no longer a *superiority*, but merely an *equality* of charms.

We have taken no notice of the third volume, which consists entirely of appendices, in number, four. The first contains, some Account of the Pontine Marshes, between Rome and Naples; the second, an Abridgment of principal Facts in the History of Naples; the third, a Descriptive and Historical Account of Mount Vesuvius; and the fourth, which occupies upwards of *three hundred pages*, some Account of the principal Buildings, Statues, Pictures, and Antiquities,

ties, remaining at Rome in 1803; including *Catalogues* of the most admired works of art still seen in the churches and palaces in that city. The whole of this volume might have been suppressed, without any loss to the reader: as its contents had previously appeared in various other publications; and as it therefore contains little that is interesting, and less that is new. It seems calculated only to enhance the price of the book, and, consequently, to promote the interest of the author and publisher.

THE PICTONIAN PROSECUTION.

1. *Colonel Fullarton's Statement, Letters, and Documents, respecting the Affairs of Trinidad.*
2. *Colonel Picton's Letter to Lord Hobart.*
3. *Colonel Fullarton's Refutation of Colonel Picton's Letter.*
4. *Evidence taken at Port of Spain in the Case of Louisa Calderon.*
5. *Extracts from the Minutes of the Council of Trinidad.*
6. *Lieutenant-Colonel Draper's Address to the British Public.*

(Continued from page 185.)

IT remains for us chiefly to notice the Letter to Sir Samuel Hood by Colonel Picton, prefixed to the "Evidence taken at Port of Spain;" and the very spirited "Address" of Lieutenant-Colonel Draper, "to the British Public." Colonel Picton begins his Letter with some very strong and pertinent observations respecting the very extraordinary means which have been adopted for rendering him odious in the eyes of the nation.

"I doubt not but you will do me the justice to believe, that the inventions of malice, and the credulity of ignorance, are equally incapable of affecting my mind, or influencing my conduct in any situation or circumstance of life; and that the indecent caricatures exhibited every where in the streets and windows, and the malignant, scandalous libels, which have inundated the metropolis, to outrage truth, and corrupt the sources of public justice, will neither succeed in alarming my apprehensions, nor irritating my disposition. Yet, I am very far from despising the judgment of the public; on the contrary, no one possesses a higher veneration for it, when calmly and coolly exercised; but to have any value in my mind, it must proceed from the operation of reason, and be the result of temperate investigation.

"The reputation which rests upon the solid foundation of honourable public services, and zealous devotion to the cause of our country, is an object of virtuous ambition, to which no well ordered mind can ever be insensible; it is the shadow which accompanies the solid substance of meritorious actions, and the evidence of their existence; it is the only genuine source of popularity, and the public opinion which rests upon any other foundation, or is derived from any other cause, though it may, for a time,

time, serve the purposes of faction and intrigue, will ever be esteemed, by prudent and discerning persons, as a counterfeit coin, and spurious imitation of the more precious metal.

" The inhabitants of this country possess, perhaps, more of the milk of human nature, than those of any other nation in the world. They are more feelingly alive to every tale of woe and oppression; and these amiable qualities are, in a great measure, the cause of their being so open to the impositions, and *canting hypocrisy of pretended philanthropists*; but they have invariably a fund of sound good sense at bottom, which will never allow any delusion to be of long duration. Such a public, when the first impression begins to subside, will naturally inquire into the causes and motives of appeals to their passions, and when an apparently public object is pursued and pressed upon them, with all the rancour and animosity of private interest and resentment, they will not be slow in suspecting some concealed selfish motive lurking beneath the specious pretext."

These are the reflections of an honest heart, united with a manly and enlightened mind. Curse on such canting hypocrites, say we, who conceal, beneath the most unbounded professions of zeal for the public good, the most mean, sordid, and selfish passions; who, with honour, truth, and justice in their mouths, have rancour, falsehood, and iniquity in their hearts. If, reader, thou shouldst ever meet with such a reptile, avoid him as thou wouldst the plague; or, in compassion to thy fellow-creatures, crush him as thou wouldst a scorpion.—Should there be a man, so lost to every honest feeling of humanity, so base, so sunk, and so degraded, as to be conscious that *he* is such a reptile (and such a man there unhappily is), to *him* we say—*Qui capit ille facit.* As to the caricatures, and all the artillery of malice which were employed, both in the King's Bench, to the great disgrace of that high tribunal, and, subsequently, in every book-stall in town, we shall have occasion to express our opinion respecting them, when we come to consider Lieutenant-Colonel Draper's pamphlet. Colonel Picton follows up these reflections, by reminding the gallant Officer whom he addresses, of the facility with which his own (Colonel Picton's) resignation, as one of the Commissioners of Trinidad, was accepted; and of the difficulty which Sir Samuel experienced in obtaining the acceptance of his. It is a very easy matter to perceive, that this different treatment originated in the same source. It was obvious, that Sir Samuel Hood's countenance to the proceedings of Col. Picton's enemies would be highly important; and that, on the other hand, his support of the Colonel would throw great discredit upon the attacks that were *meditated* against him; we say, meditated, because none but a perfect ideot can fail to perceive that the enmity and opposition which he encountered, had been long meditated—they were the work of deep foresight, and cold-blooded calculation.

" The disagreements amongst the Commissioners" (says Col. Picton), " produced, at least, one good consequence, as they led to the abolition of a chimerical system of government, which has realized the apprehensions of every practical statesman, by producing an infinity of evil, and

no

no one advantage, except a convincing proof of its impracticability, which may deter future theoretical politicians from attempting a similar incongruity."

It was as pretty a piece of patch-work as the Peace of Amiens itself; but we beg pardon, we ought to reprove the Colonel for his presumptuous censure of such a master-piece of wisdom in the art of government; and to remind him of the chorus of an old song—

"What, do you think the DOCTOR don't know better than you?"

Colonel Picton then notices the stage trick of converting a little Mulatto prostitute and thief, whom a mistaken lenity had saved from the gallows, into an interesting little innocent, as such presented by Mrs. Fullarton to her friends, and as such introduced into the Court of King's Bench, with suitable animadversions, by that grand master of the dramatic art, Mr. Garrow. He afterwards gives a true picture of his own situation in Trinidad, of the great disadvantages under which he laboured, and of the honourable motives which influenced his conduct.

"You well know, Sir, that I was placed, without any solicitation, as a matter of professional duty, in a most extraordinary situation, at the head of a new conquest, without any legal adviser to guide me in the administration of an intricate system of foreign laws, written in a foreign language; without any magistrate legally constituted, or acquainted with the jurisprudence of the country to execute them; without any law books, except such as I could casually pick up on the spot; without any council, with whom I could share the responsibility, and without any detailed instructions to supply the deficiency; and that, so situated, I was left six years solely to my own judgment and discretion to carry on the business of the Colony in the best manner I could. Thus circumstanced, what more could reasonably be expected of me, than that I should act honestly, to the extent of my abilities, with the best advice I could procure in the place? How is it possible that I could become acquainted with the *laws*, or the *practice* of them, except from the books within my reach, and the magistrates who were most accustomed to their application? I did guide myself on this, as well as on every other occasion, by the advice of the magistrates and other law officers—the only sources of legal information or practice; and, if more is required of me, I am ready to confess that I am not capable of impossibilities. However, Sir, if I were to estimate my merits in so novel a situation, by the assurances of confidence and approbation which I continued officially to receive from the high authorities under which I acted, up to the very moment of my resignation, I might allow myself to indulge in very considerable claims and pretensions, without incurring a charge of extravagance; but I have learnt to estimate such assurances by the consequences which have followed them, and which it is not within the bounds of probability that I shall early or easily forget."

No, indeed, a prosecution which has lasted upwards of two years, during which every attempt that the basest malignity of the human heart

heart could suggest, or the most subtle ingenuity of interested malice could devise, has been made to defame his character, to destroy his peace, and to ruin his fortune, is not very likely to be forgotten. We may be allowed to hope, however, that the moment of justice, the hour of truth, the day of retribution, is near at hand.

"I trust that the English people are too reasonable to require of me more than they would of any other person of moderate abilities, under similar circumstances. Let any one of them suppose himself" (aye, even Mr. Garrow, with his whole stock of legal knowledge, his quirks, and his quibbles, his pantomimes and puppets to boot!) "posted where I was, without any solicitation and intrigue on his part: would he be satisfied to be placed in the midst of darkness, and then punished for not seeing clearly? I am ordered to administer an intricate system of laws, of which I am totally ignorant, and then I am made accountable for the errors (which) I involuntarily committed, and criminally prosecuted for what I could not possibly avoid."

We cannot here refrain from noticing a most extraordinary position advanced by Mr. Garrow, on the trial of Colonel Picton.

"I understand we are to be told, that although the highest authority in this country could not inflict such a punishment"—(the picquet, which is frequently inflicted in our regiments of cavalry),—"on the meanest individual, yet, that by the laws of Spain, such a practice may be justified in the Island of Trinidad. I should venture to assert, without the smallest danger of contradiction from any unprejudiced person, that if it were written in characters so impossible to be mistaken, that he who runs may read, that the torture was the acknowledged law of the Island of Trinidad, this would supply no vindication of a British Governor."

Now, in order to estimate the value of Mr. Garrow's assertion, it will only be necessary to supply a direct and positive contradiction of it from the Lord Chief Justice himself, leaving it to Mr. Garrow to decide whether his Lordship be an "unprejudiced man" or not.

"Lord ELLENBOROUGH.—"If what the defendant has done be not under the authority of law, he ought to be punished; *if under that authority, he ought to be quit and go free.*"—Trial, p. 70.

But, according to Mr. Garrow, Colonel Picton ought to have governed the Island by "the mild, benign, and equitable spirit of British jurisprudence;" that is, in direct contradiction to those instructions which he was imperatively ordered to follow, and which directed him to take the Spanish law for his guide.

With equal truth did this distinguished Pleader assert, that Colonel Picton had inflicted "torture upon one of his Majesty's subjects" (whom the mild, benign, and equitable spirit of British jurisprudence would infallibly have consigned to the gallows), "without the least motive but to gratify a tyrannical disposition, to oppress an unfortunate and defenceless victim of his cruelty." In opening a criminal charge,

to

to the honour of the British Bar be it said, it is an invariable rule never to indulge in the smallest exaggeration of the imputed offence; and never to state any thing which cannot be substantiated by evidence. And the Barrister who wantonly and wilfully departs from this rule, exposes himself to imputations which every man of honour, and of feeling, would shudder to incur. Now, in the present instance, the Lord Chief Justice again supplies us with a contradiction of the Barrister's assertion, respecting the malicious motives of the defendant.

"Mr. DALLAS.—I was about to state, my Lord, simply this, that there was no evidence of express malice.

"Lord ELLENBOROUGH.—*It is not even pretended.*"

Our readers, however, have seen that it was not only *pretended*, but positively *asserted*, by Mr. Garrow. We return to Colonel Picton's Letter, the concluding passage of which we shall extract.

"The most wicked and indefensible means have been made use of to pre-occupy the public mind with opinions unfavourable to me, at a time when a cause of the utmost importance to my character and fortune is depending in the Court of King's Bench; a conduct the more atrocious, as it is manifestly calculated to deprive me of a fair impartial trial, by influencing the passions of those who eventually are to be my judges: an attempt which, I trust confidently, the people of this country will not see without indignation.

"All I ask of them is, what religion and morality equally require as indispensable duties, that they abstain from rash premature judgment; and wait until they fairly and fully hear both sides of the question, before they give their verdict against an officer who has been serving them with zeal and fidelity for nearly thirty-seven years. I solicit no reward, I ask no favours; but I demand as a right, what they cannot refuse me without injustice, an impartial hearing, and a suspension of judgment, until the final issue of the new trial I am about to move for."

No man of honour or honesty will refuse to acknowledge the existence of such a right, or suffer his conduct to supply a contradiction to the acknowledgement. We now turn to Lieutenant-Colonel Draper's Address. In his "Advertisement," the author notices an attempt to shut up the avenue of the press, so scandalous in its nature, and so mischievous in its consequences, as to extort the reprobation and abhorrence of every friend to the freedom of the press, and, at the same time, to mark the base and dishonest efforts which have been excited to mislead the public mind, and to prevent the promulgation of truth.

"It may appear," says this intelligent and spirited writer, "both superfluous and unnecessary to add any thing to the various important reasons which I have assigned for this publication in the body of the work. One yet remains, which I am sure my readers will not consider either superfluous or unnecessary in me to annex.

"When an attempt has been made to shut up the avenues to public information, and when that attempt can be *proved* to have been but too successful, it demands a very serious notice.

"The

"The *basest* industry used by Mr. Fullarton to disseminate his cruel slanders against Colonel Picton, required, from all impartial men, that every fair opportunity should be afforded him to contradict and refute them. The charges brought forward were of an unpopular nature, ingeniously and purposely calculated and used to produce hatred and disgust; and when these came to be powerfully assisted by national prejudice, it behoved that class of the community, who are the only *regular* channels to public opinion, to be free, liberal, and impartial in their conduct to *both* sides. We shall see whether this impartial conduct has marked the proceedings of the Scotch booksellers on the occasion.

"When Colonel Picton published his Letter to Lord Hobart, the late Colonial Secretary, and now Earl of Buckinghamshire, a friend desired his bookseller, Mr. Lloyd, of Harley-street, to send fifty copies of the Letter to booksellers in Edinburgh of the names of Manners and Miller. The copies were sent; and the following is the answer which Mr. Lloyd received from them:

"'SIR, *Edinburgh, 28th Nov.* 1804.

"'We were favoured with yours of the 20th, informing us that you had sent us by the coach fifty copies of a pamphlet, entitled 'A Letter to Lord Hobart from General Picton,' to be advertised and sold at 2s. 6d.

"'We received the pamphlet yesterday; but on looking over it, we find it reflects too much on the character of Colonel Fullarton, that we most beg leave to decline having any concern in the publication. You will, perhaps, be surprised at this; but the fact is, we are very much connected with the friends of Colonel Fullarton, and have so great a respect for himself, that we should do ourselves a very material injury by selling the pamphlet in question, &c.

"(Signed) 'MANNERS AND MILLER.

"'*To Mr. Lloyd, Bookseller, Harley-street.*'

"The gentleman then desired Mr. Lloyd to write to a Mr. Creech, who, I understand, is reputed one of the most opulent and *respectable* booksellers in that country, also living in Edinburgh, and to request he would advertise and publish the Letter.

"My friend was naturally a little suspicious of what might be the result; and although Mr. Creech agreed to Mr. Lloyd's proposal, yet from Mr. Creech stating in his letter, that Mr. Fullarton 'was in his shop at the time the parcel containing the Letters arrived,' he requested Major M'Donnel, of the 83d regiment, to call at Creech's shop to purchase one of them. The following is an extract from the Major's letter on the subject:

"'I called, according to your wish, at Creech's, to purchase one of General Picton's Letters, and was informed by the person in the shop, 'that it could not be sold.''—And Major M'Donnel, with that manliness so characteristic of him, adds,—'I consider the booksellers to have acted under very despicable unmanly principles: however, it appears to me every object has been answered without them.

"(Signed) 'C. M'DONNEL.

"'*Edinburgh, Feb.* 11, 1805.'

"The publication of this Letter was thus totally, and most unjustly, prevented in one very large and important quarter of the empire.

"I am

"I am not fond of national reflections. I love and esteem many Scotchmen; some whom I am proud, and honoured, by being called their friend. A whole nation has, in ancient times, been saved on account of *one* good man. I do not wish, or mean, to arraign that nation; and if it be any consolation to the Scotch booksellers to know, that on this side the Tweed persons, in nearly a similar line of business, can do illiberal and unjust things, I insert an advertisement, which was brought by a friend of mine to the Publishers of the Morning Chronicle and the Morning Post*, and a copy left at each office. The person, on his first visit, seeing a sort of reluctance, or indecision, in their assent to print it, said he would call again, requested them to consider it, and, if they agreed, he would *pay* for it on his return. That night he called at each office, but could get no answer; the next day he called three different times, but could neither see the Editors, nor receive any answer. The advertisement, of course, never appeared.

"ADVERTISEMENT.

"'In the very interesting and important case of the King against Governor Picton, it is due to the justice of the country, that until the decision of the Court of King's Bench on the points reserved for its consideration be known, all partial comments should be avoided; as we understand, as soon as this determination is pronounced, the trial will be published from the accurate notes of a very eminent short-hand writer; when the public, then in full possession of every fact, will draw its conclusions with that good sense and candour which form so distinguished and honourable a feature in the national character.'

"Here is no general or particular remark or observation, not a single word to influence public opinion. This then, I say, is illiberal conduct in any case, Scotch or English; in the present, I hold it highly criminal. If the Editors know the circumstance, they should be ashamed of it; if they do not, which I very much doubt, it is right they should be made acquainted with it. It is one of the many base, ungenerous, and unmanly ways, which has been practised towards Colonel Picton, to prejudice him and his cause, and to obstruct and prevent truth from getting admission to the public. It is a most serious injury to the national character, and well deserves stronger and more severe animadversion. Let them now 'throw in a paragraph,' if they think proper. *We* shall read it with perfect complacence, careless whether it come 'from *authority*,' or not."

If such conduct were suffered to pass without public reprobation, the press might, in time, become a *curse* instead of a *blessing*, as it now is, when fairly and impartially used. Mr. Fullarton, we will venture to say, never found any difficulty to obtain admission for his articles, though it be neither his wish, nor in his power, to compose one so perfectly free from objection as that which was rejected

---

* "The Editors of both these papers are, as I am informed, Scotchmen; it is clear that they *gained* nothing by their transplantation."

by

by his countrymen here. As to the Edinburgh booksellers, the first of them acted like contemptible cowards, and the latter much worse. And now that we are upon this subject, we cannot but express our admiration of the superabundant delicacy of our brother Critics, who suffer such a flagrant attempt to stifle inquiry, and to suppress truth, to escape without a single animadversion! And though all parties expressly appeal to the public, these scrupulous directors of the public judgment most cautiously abstain from offering any opinion upon the subject. One of them, indeed, has sagaciously discovered the intemperance of Lieutenant-Colonel Draper's language, "in his attack on a very respectable character, Mr. Sullivan." Whatever Mr. Sullivan may be, his character is certainly not more respectable than that of Colonel Picton, or those of many other gentlemen, Mr. Fullarton's scurrilous and most intemperate attacks upon whom have not incurred the censure of these Critics. But the different treatment experienced by the different parties, might, we suspect, be easily accounted for, without any reference to the canons of criticism. Lieutenant-Colonel Draper now assigns his reason, and a very sufficient reason it is, for the early publication of his Address.

"Although this Address was not intended for publication at so early a period of the business to which it relates, yet the scandalous use which has been made of a circumstance that occurred upon the trial, and in the Court of King's Bench, and which, it is allowed on all hands, was entirely of a new and unparalleled kind, has been productive of so much public mischief, has so irritated and prejudiced the temper and opinions of the larger part of the community, the middling and lower classes, and has been turned to such vulgar and dishonourable purposes by the enemies of Colonel Picton, ever on the watch to lay hold of any circumstance even less authoritative than that which issued from the Court, that I hold myself exonerated from any imputation of haste, rashness, or unseasonableness, in now printing a work, which it is probable, but for these circumstances, I should have deferred to a later period. The circumstance to which I allude is a picture of Louisa Calderon on the picket, I believe a coloured drawing, which was produced by Mr. Garrow, and shewn to the Jury, '*by way of explaining the instrument of torture, and to shew how and in what manner she was placed upon it.*' *Nothing else was meant:* for Mr. Garrow, in my hearing, told the Noble Lord on the Bench, when he presented this delectable treat to Mademoiselle Calderon, 'I wish the position of your Lordship could have enabled you to have seen the *involuntary* expression of the sensation of the witness on the inspection of the drawing;' Mr. Garrow no doubt *intending*, that what he said to the Judge should not be heard by the Jury; for in his speech afterwards he said, 'Gentlemen, with respect to the picture which has been stated to have inflamed your minds, &c. I ask nothing of your passions;'—No, nothing at all. I don't want *you*, gentlemen, to witness 'this involuntary expression of the witness's sensations;'—this dramatic exhibition is reserved entirely for the entertainment of his Lordship. Mr. Garrow desires that *you*, Gentlemen of the Jury, should shut your eyes, and go to sleep a little, while the Noble Judge should not only be awake, but should change

change his position, and turn on the other side, to please Mr. Garrow, and see and enjoy this farcical scene, which he had with so much taste and ingenuity invented for his Lordship's sole entertainment. The Noble and Learned Judge turned away from such mimickry; he deprecated such tricks; and expressed a hope that no use would be made of it out of doors: yet the picture now before me is printed, and marked thus: '*With a Plate of the Girl, Pulley, Spike, and the Grilles, &c.; from a Drawing exhibited in Court.—Printed for Crosby and Co., Stationers'-court, Ludgate-street.*'—Such is the happy effect of Mr. Garrow's matchless invention. It was not necessary for me to change *my* position, to see the neat and adroit *manner* in which Mr. Garrow made this exhibition; for I had the happiness and honour of being *very near* him; and I was, no doubt, astonished at the wonderful art and dexterity he displayed. Katterfelto or Breslaw could not have exceeded him. As the musicians speak, there was a *fineness of finger* in the elegant manner in which he first turned up this drawing; of which no adept in legerdemain need be ashamed. The finger and the tongue, too, moved in such perfect unison, that not a performer amongst them could rival him. The *effect* was so sudden, so unexpected, so electric, so full of all the necessary qualities to call forth surprise, astonishment, and 'delightful horror,' that Burke himself, if he were alive, would have gone to school again, and taken a lecture from him to add to the next edition of his 'Sublime and Beautiful.' I endeavour to smother the real honest indignation which I feel at this most unbecoming exhibition, by giving it an air of ridicule which is really very ill suited to, and inconsistent with, the subject. It should be stigmatised and condemned by every description of persons, as a disgrace to the Court, and a reflection on the known purity of its high character: it should be branded with every indignant epithet, and scouted from the possibility of such an unseemly representation ever again making its appearance in a tribunal, whose forms and practices should be of the most sacredly decorous order. Mr. Garrow should have reflected, that while, in this case, he was *seemingly* only doing Punch in the show, and bringing out one of the puppets, or posture-masters, to make people wonder and stare, he was producing sensations and effects of another, very different, and more dangerous nature: Like the bite of the Cobra de Capello, which Mr. Garrow will understand by the help of his Dictionary of Natural History, it had something of the magic effect, but more of the poisonous and deadly consequences, that follow the teeth of this venomous animal. But why should I wonder at Mr. Garrow's various powers: he is an experienced trader in 'hot and cold;' and I have very lately read an address of his, in which nothing could exceed the eloquence he displayed, in impressing '*impartiality*' on the minds of the Jury; and I dare say that he believed *himself* in every word he *said at the time*. Like Mr. Garrow, I too love ingenuous exercises, and, like him, I sometimes give shrewd opinions. I say, then, that in my humble opinion, if Mr. Garrow possesses one faculty superior to another, it is VERSATILITY; I think it transcends his knowledge of metaphysics, of which I have given a very beautiful specimen in this work. He is really a Proteus, a word that, by the help of his mythological learning (which I am told is equal to his metaphysical), he will understand the meaning of. An intellect like his is worthy of a nice analysis; and if Mr. Garrow adds an expanded philanthropy to his other great qualities,

when, sooner or later, his spirit visits the mansions of *peace*, which, for the *happiness* and *quiet* of this nether world, may fate long forbid, he will direct his brain, together with the cranium to which it belongs, to be sent to the celebrated Dr. Gall, of Vienna, for the full and complete elucidation of that most wonderful and useful science of craniology, which HIS profound genius has also invented: it will be no doubt a great satisfaction to his purer part, *then* to ascertain, what our impurer minds here have only *doubted*, that an empty skull can furnish just as much *talk* as a full one.

"I have said some coarse, as well as some fine, things to Mr. Garrow in this book. I did not contemplate his character thoroughly at that time, or I should not have been *seriously* angry with him. However, he has often transgressed himself in this way, and, like all old incorrigible sinners, is no doubt of an *allowing* temper and disposition. Now that I do pretend to know him better, and to think *very little* of whatever he may say, I promise never to be in a rage again. Whenever he 'snatches a grace beyond the reach of art,' as in the beautiful metaphysical distinction alluded to, he will pardon me, if I always consider it my duty to record his felicities with fidelity: but when he gets to the chin, and flounders in the mud of Spanish law, then, indeed,

"'*Laugh* when we must, be witty where we can,
But vindicate the ways of *man to man*.'

"My poetry will relieve his mind, perhaps, after some elaborate and recondite metaphysical research; and wishing to put him in a musical humour, and in good temper, I beg leave to offer him the above distich, '*pour s'amuser*,' which, by the help of his French Dictionary, he will be able soon to translate."

Many of these reflections will, no doubt, by common readers, who look not beyond the superficies of things, be deemed too severe; but, in our apprehension, the occasion both called for, and justifies, their severity. It is horrible to see the purity of our courts polluted, and their solemnity outraged, by a miserable recourse to pantomimic tricks, and other *Flocktonian* exhibitions; and though the Judge would not admit the production of the wretched caricature of the Mulatto prostitute on the picquet, without the *permission* of the Counsel for the Defendant, yet, with all due deference to his Lordship, be it said, that if he deemed it improper, which he unquestionably did, he should have issued his imperative prohibition against its production. It was, in truth, a disgrace to a court of justice, and cannot be too strongly reprobated. Mr. Garrow, by a happy adaptation of his wit to the subject before him, advised, that henceforth the punishment of the picquet might receive a new name, and be called *Pictoning*—exquisite pleasantry! *Quel bel esprit!* But we should imagine that his mirth would have been turned to wrath, if Mr. Dallas had, in answer, nicknamed him the *Forensic Flockton*. Let him take care; criminal trials are not subjects for merriment (at least to *clients*); and if we witness any farther attempt to disgrace our courts of justice by trick and mummery, we will raise our voice against the author of it, in strains

strains that will sound most harshly in his ear. Lieutenant-Colonel Draper apologizes with the temper, and in the language, of a gentleman, for the asperity manifested in many parts of his Address.—This apology is directed to "the many noble personages into whose hands it will come." He truly adds: "The language and conduct due from one gentleman to another, I trust will be allowed me by those noble persons, that, from my rank and situation in life, I ought to, and do, understand." No man, we venture to assert, understands them better. The spirit of a gentleman, properly so called, pervades every page of his book.

"The case here, however, is not between TWO gentlemen; and although I do not hold this as any excuse for an infringement of the proprieties of conduct and discourse, yet it will be recollected that there was inseparably attached to my work an office most irksome, but most indispensable;—the exposition of vulgar vice, and malignant calumny;—the detection of mean hypocrisy, of wanton malice, and insidious fraud. I am not experienced in this sort of work; it is my first, and I trust it will be my last, effort; it will therefore, I hope, be pardoned me by those noble persons, if, in the exposition of some new turpitude, I sometimes gave way to the expression of feelings in words, perhaps more remarkable for the strong signification of the idea, than the elegance or beauty of their selection. It will, I think, be allowed, that I have traversed through ways new and unknown to me, and if I have designated the leading places in my road by harsh and coarse sounding appellations, those only are to be condemned who went before, and first affixed the uncouth and unseemly epithets *."

And yet this same Mr. Fullarton has the assurance to talk of his *delicacy*, his *moderation*, and his *conciliatory disposition*. *Proh Pudor!*

We had intended to bring our observations on this prosecution to a conclusion in the present Number; but we find that, without either extending the article to an unusual length, or omitting remarks which appear to us of consequence, we cannot carry our intention into effect. Besides, we have received an Address, which Mr. Fullarton has had the presumption to distribute among the Electors of Westminster, with a view to injure that gallant officer, Sir Samuel Hood, in their opinion. This curious paper, which arises out of this prosecution, will require some animadversions from us. These reasons compel us to postpone our farther observations to another month.

(To be concluded in our next.)

---

* "One specimen will suffice.—'The most atrocious malefactor'—(alluding to Colonel Picton)—'who ever disgraced the English name and character, invested with any portion of public authority.'—*Vide page* 90 *of Mr. Fullarton's first quarto.*

NOVELS.

Edward and Anna; or, a Picture of Human Life. A Novel. By John Bristed, of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple, Author of the System of the Quakers examined. 2 vols. 12mo. Pp. 443. 7s. Crosby and Co. 1806.

MUCH as we have been inclined to despise the productions of modern Novel writers collectively, from finding them the repositories of unmeaning *sentimentality* and ridiculous frivolity, we have nevertheless been far from consigning them to general censure; but on the contrary, have considered our labour to be amply compensated on meeting, after a month's application to the drudgery of perusing them, with a single work which we might venture to recommend as entertaining or instructive. We must, however, admit that we have derived most gratification from the Novels produced by a few masculine writers of talent, who have devoted themselves to this branch of literature, and after the contrasts which we have lately exhibited, there is no doubt that our readers will agree with us, that MEN *of letters* are the best writers of works of fiction. Yet far be it from us to insinuate that many of our literatæ do not rank very high in such efforts of genius: we shall shortly point out those who do rise superior to the common manufacturers for circulating libraries. On the other hand, that some *men* have thought themselves qualified for writing a *good* Novel, and have been egregiously deceived, we shall adduce one simple instance, in the case of the author before us.

Many excuses and reasons have been offered for writing, as well ludicrous as serious, but till we read Mr. Bristed's production, we never heard *insanity* alleged as a palliative for literary incapacity; though it is probable that the good nature of the public has often induced them to preconceive the necessity of such a defence.

It seems that "on the ninth day of the first month of that year, which now forms a portion of our fleeting life," the day on which the body of Lord Nelson was deposited in the tomb, Mr. Bristed was taken ill; or, to use his own words, "a fever's fire ran along *all* his veins, and disabled him from attending to weightier matters of the law." He *therefore* resolved to write a Novel, and we quote the following excuse from his Preface, not, let the reader observe, for any inconsistency or defect in the work; but "for any incorrectness in the *poetical citations!*" "In order to beguile the dreary hours which wheeled heavily their *pale course*, and slowly rolled their wan, dejected forms, over my enfeebled and disordered frame, as I lay alone in my solitary chamber, waiting wistfully the approach of dawn; a dawn that to my eyes was not to bring the sight of *vernal bloom*, or *summer's rose* (it would be odd if it had, in January), nor flocks, nor herds, nor human face divine, my heart said unto me—tell that *which thou thyself hast seen and known*, unto the sons and daughters of thy native isle. I obeyed the dictates of my heart, and during the visions of the night my *burning, withering brain* CREATED and composed the incidents which form this little simple tale; and on each succeeding day those incidents were committed to paper. Within the circle of *seven days and seven nights* this child of my feeble drooping fancy, was *conceived, born,* nurtured,

nurtured, grew, and was *matured:* for even now, while I am penning this Preface, the midnight bell is tolling the departed hour of the 15th day, and announces the birth of the 16th morn of this month."

We then learn, that after the author had performed this seven days' wonder, the Almighty raised him from the bed of sickness; when "he could not suffer the delicious dreams of fancy, and the wild wanderings of the imagination to occupy a *single hour* that could possibly be employed so much more beneficially by gaining an accession of legal knowledge!" With respect to his tale, "its sole aim is to shew that atheism and infidelity, under every aspect of life lead to misery; and that religion and virtue ensure to their votaries peace and happiness." The author however, is afraid that the main plot of his tale, the attachment between Edward and Anna, will be thought not to accord with his position! How necessary it is for some writers to explain their meaning, without giving their readers the trouble to find it out! If Mr. Bristed had not thus early informed us of his views, we should have taken this *main plot* to hold out an indirect encouragement for one of the grossest breaches of moral rectitude! Its substance is as follows.

A beneficed clergyman of the Church of England, who resides near Oxford, a grave man of 45, marries the daughter of a deceased officer, who is not quite 18. The husband is represented as one of the most apathetic brutes which can disgrace human existence, and the Lady as a paragon of female beauty, "arrayed in all the undisguised fervour of imperious charms." Edward, the son of a public officer in a high civil station, is educated at a grammar school, and then sent to Oxford. He is represented as possessing an impetuosity of temper, and a quickness in discerning the weakness of others, without guarding himself from danger; together with a feeling heart and a romantic and untempered generosity. Anna is of the pensive, mild, blue eyed, sentimental cast, and who, when first met with by Edward, is in a state of fixed melancholy, arising from the brutal conduct of her husband. Here, then, is as hopeful a trio as any that is to be found in a sentimental Novel of the German School. It is hardly necessary to state, that when Edward and Anna first see each other a *violent affection* commences between them. The clergyman tells him that his wife has been ill ever since their marriage, and advises him to prescribe for her, he having studied physic at the University. Edward, however, pretending that he must hear the Lady's complaint in private, gets Mr. Martin's (the clergyman) *permission* to visit her in her chamber whenever he pleases; Mr. Martin being too much engaged with the beauties of Eusebius and other Greek authors to have any time for domestic attentions. Edward then exerts himself to "minister to a mind diseased," and learns that the Lady detests her husband, partly on account of having been forced to marry him by her mother, and also from his want of attention to her person. Edward begins his medical process by expressing the *purity* and *ardour* of *his* affection. Of the nature of this ardour we may form an idea from the author's own language, who with all the cant of German sentimentality, when Anna tells Edward that he must not *kiss her* because she is married, makes him answer, "that in this imperfect state of existence he must have recourse to the only means which are allowed him of expressing the purity and ardour of his affection:" and he *convinces her* "that words are but weak and faint to express the fervour of

unutterable love, which is conveyed with much more intelligible and impressive characters by the liquid language of the eyes, beaming mutual joy; by the balmy kisses of the rosy lip; by the enraptured foldings of the close embrace, when the boundings of each bosom beat with a more tumultuous throb; and the purple light of love upon each other's cheek assume a crimson dye!" After imbibing this palpable dose of mental medicine, Anna *to gain time*, expresses a wish *to learn Latin*, and in a few weeks, Edward teaches her that "*Omnia vincit amor!*" At length Mr. Martin finding that the juvenile practitioner is *too often* alone with his wife, gives him a hint that he will call in a more experienced son of Galen, from Oxford; and Edward, *after many a heart-rending exertion*, sets out for London. Now, gentle reader, notwithstanding this strict intimacy, this "union of kindred souls," which prevailed between Edward and the Parson's wife, you must not presume to suppose that any *improper* familiarity occurred. Oh! no; that would be contrary to all the laws of sentimental Novel writing. The neighbours however, were so censorious as to tell Mr. Martin what *they* thought; on which, after Edward's departure, he "*preached a sermon*" to Anna, on the subjection of wives, and then forbade her to write to her paramour. This mandate we should have thought reasonable enough; but Anna, poor sympathetic soul, could not brook the "hateful restraint," and accordingly corresponds with her lover, who is seeking his fortune in the metropolis; and who "reposed in the *ardour*, the *purity*, and the *permanency* of her affection for him" (Vol. i. p. 146);

"Till he and Anna would arise and reach their native skies,
And there in some mild sphere would sing their pleasures, loves, and joys."

[N. B. This in the original, is PROSE; but with a stroke of the pen we have transferred it into something like verse.]

As the author has piqued himself upon his *main plot*, we will bring our abstract of it to a conclusion, before we touch on the subordinate characters. Anna, writhing under the horrors of seclusion, and oppressed to the grave by the barbarous conduct of her husband (who, be it observed, is not accused of any other *cruelty* than a want of attention towards her, which perhaps his advanced age and serious habits might justify), says in one of her letters to Edward, that perhaps she may not see him again on earth, "but surely, she adds, (p. 70) we shall meet and resolve our *affectionate intercourse* in Heaven!

"There shall we bask in uncreated rays;
No more to sigh, or shed the bitter tear;
Together hymning our Creator's praise,
In such society yet still more dear,
While circling time rolls round in an eternal sphere!"

Whatever Mr. B. may think of it, this approaches very near to *blasphemy*.—This also, is given as *prose* in the original!!

The end of this "strange eventful history" is, that a brother of Anna, an officer in the army, comes from abroad, and hearing that his sister has been seduced by Edward, resolves to punish him *like a man of honour*. He accordingly sends for him to a Coffee-house, where, on his arrival, the Captain is so struck with his generous physiognomy, that he declares his resentment *is buried*, and gives him his hand and heart *as a brother*.

brother. But five minutes afterwards this resentment *rises again*; (p. 110, vol. ii.) they knock each other about the Coffee-room, and then repair to Chalk Farm, with a full determination "not to MURDER, but to *kill* each other!"—Admirable distinction! Here they fire till the Captain is killed, and Edward mortally wounded. Anna, on hearing the news, dies of a broken heart: (Tom Thumb the second!) and the clergyman *of the Church of England* is made (*i. e.* by the author) to write a letter to Edward, in which he expresses his belief that Anna, *and her two children* who died just before their mother, are to be everlastingly tormented, while Edward is to receive *a double portion* of brimstone and fire!

To form the *filling-up-stuff* of these two absurd volumes, various characters are introduced, but they are one and all, except William, and Edward's father, beneath criticism, and almost beneath contempt. No such character as Diggory ever existed, we are certain. Indeed to call such traits "Pictures of Human Life" can excite nothing but laughter. The only part of the Novel worthy of praise, is a dialogue between an atheist and a Christian, in the first volume. The style is the most bombastic and inflated we ever remember to have read. In many parts it is absolute nonsense, and in others perfectly unintelligible. *Ex. Grat.* In the Preface, page xiv. we are told that "*adultery is an act which poisons all the living waters of the land in their* SPRINGS *and in their* SOURCES!" At page 21, Edward, on kissing Anna, "became more than usually audacious, and the flame of young desire *more dazzling, daring, fierce, keen-shivering, shot his nerves along!*" At page 25, *another kiss* "thrilled through every vein, and *keen-shivering, shot his nerves along*;" and at another part this *keen-shivering shoots*, like electricity *along* the nerves of a whole party! In vol. i. page 44, we are told, that "no rude unlicensed *foot* must be ever suffered to pollute the *hallowed sources of sensibility.*" It is a pity that the author has not informed us whether these sources lie in that part which Butler considers to be the *seat* of knowledge! —But it would be an endless task to point out all the strange metaphors and mutilations of poor common-sense contained in these 443 pages; numbers of which are filled with quotations from Burns, the Scottish Poet.—We shall therefore conclude, with hoping that Mr. Bristed's *clients* will derive more advantage from his legal pursuits, than the public will from the effusions of his fancy. We can see no moral lesson deducible from the whole story; and if the author wrote it when he was *deranged*, we think that when he came to his senses, he ought to have thrown the manuscript into the fire.

MISCELLANIES.

Diamond cut Diamond: or Observations on a Pamphlet, entitled, "A Review of the Conduct of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales;" comprising a free and impartial View of Mr. Jefferys, as a Tradesman, Politician, and Courtier, during a Period of Twenty Years. By Philo-Veritas. 8vo. Pp. 76. 3s. 6d. Chapple. 1806.

IN a Letter to Mr. Jefferys, prefixed to this pamphlet, the author accuses him of having written two letters to the Prince of Wales, which

he has not published, containing a specific demand of two thousand pounds, with a threat of publishing his Review of the Prince's Conduct, if his demand should not be granted. And this application is termed "the act of a felon to extort money." Whether it be felony or not, would require more knowledge of the law to decide than this writer appears to possess; but unquestionably it was a most reprehensible, and, indeed, a criminal, act. The pamphlet opens with the following paragraphs:

"The example of a neighbouring nation has given irrefragable proof of the danger which is attached to any effort that is made, to poison and alienate the affections of a people from their Prince. If Princes are liable to the calumny of every vain, wanton, and disappointed man, the public will, in time, lose that reverence and respect which a people ought to manifest for their governors. Neither Prince nor laws can long retain their proper tone of power, when the people relax in respect for them.

"The body politic will soon become a *moulting system*, inflated with perpetual dissention and discord, when *its* subjects are taught to look at Princes, as characters possessing all the inferior qualities of the human heart."

The language is neither very correct, nor yet perfectly intelligible. The sentiment, however, which it is intended to convey, is sufficiently obvious, and the truth of it we, certainly, are by no means disposed to contest. But we sincerely wish that this writer, who seems to think so justly of the example afforded by the French Revolution, had condescended to drop, for a moment, the language of a partisan, and to adopt the tone of a patriot. Certain it is, that the dreadful events of the last sixteen years hold out the lesson which he seeks to inculcate; but they also hold out another lesson, equally profitable and instructive, which seems wholly to have escaped his observation—they hold out a lesson to *Princes* as well as to *people*. If they teach the latter the wisdom and the duty of respecting their superiors, they also teach the former so to conduct themselves, as to *deserve* the respect which they aspire to *command*. The character of that monster in human shape, the Duc D'Orleans, supplied, alas! food for calumny even to satiety. Tainted with every vice, exotic as well as native, he neglected every duty, religious, moral, and social. A debauchee, a drunkard, and an adulterer, he exchanged the society of his equals for low and abandoned associates; he left the most amiable of wives to pine in solitude, while he resigned all the comforts and joys of domestic life for sensual gratification, and the beastly licentiousness of the stews. The revolutionists could not desire a better subject for their purpose. By imputing the vices which this Prince really possessed, to the whole race of Princes in general, they misled the weak and credulous multitude, who, seeing this one example before them, were easily made to believe that others were like him; and hence all that respect for their superiors, which, among the French, was carried even to enthusiasm, was destroyed, and anarchy and confusion ensued. It follows, then, that, while the people, on the one hand, should be warned, by this dreadful example, of the fatal effects of listening to the voice of accusing calumny, when directed against those whom their religion teaches them to honour; Princes should, on the other, derive from the same example a conviction of the necessity of discharging every religious, moral,

moral, and social duty, with such punctuality, as to leave to calumny no food to prey upon. These are the lessons which the French Revolution supplies; and he who inculcates the one without the other, may serve a particular cause, but will not serve his country.

The author imputes, and justly enough, we think, the distress of Mr. Jefferys to his own extravagance; and clearly shews, that his style of living was infinitely above his circumstances. If a jeweller will "keep the establishment of a Prince, and give the dinners of a King," what but ruin can be expected to ensue? It is needless, after the remarks which we ourselves made in our Review of Mr. Jefferys's pamphlet, to follow this writer through his observations, which are much to the same effect. It is necessary, however, to say, that he has preferred two or three charges against Mr. Jefferys (in Pp. 57, 58, 59), which, if true, ought to have been the subject of criminal prosecutions; but they were denied publicly by Mr. Jefferys, in the newspapers; and though this be the *sixth* edition of the pamphlet before us, and *considerably enlarged*, no notice whatever is taken of that denial, nor is any proof adduced in support of the charges themselves. The public cannot be satisfied with *silence* on such a subject.

We agree with our author that "there is not a gentleman in the kingdom who is held in higher estimation for talents, humanity, courage, and honour, than Lord Moira:" and that no earthly considerations would "induce his Lordship to wound the feelings, oppress an injured man, or become the instrument of a mean act."

Had the author limited his efforts to the justification of the Prince, he would have acted meritoriously and prudently; but when he becomes the partisan of Mrs. Fitzherbert, talks seriously "of *the delicacy and respect due to a female*," and threatens to chastise Mr. Jefferys for daring to impeach the spotless purity of that paragon of virtue, we can scarcely believe him to be serious. If he mean to be witty, his joke is certainly misplaced; but if serious, he will be condemned by every man in the kingdom whose good opinion is worth having.—"An *ungentlemanly* attack on a *worthy and much-esteemed lady*"!!! *Risum teneatis lectores?*

The Diamond new Pointed; being a Supplement to Diamond cut Diamond: containing Three Letters which Mr. Jefferys sent to the Earl of Moira, with a View to extort Money from His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, with Observations thereon, in a Letter to Mr. Jefferys; including Remarks on his Letter to Mrs. Fitzherbert, and many Facts never before published. By Philo-Veritas. 8vo. Pp. 50. 2s. Chapple. 1806.

WE forbore to comment on the *style* and *language* of the pamphlet reviewed in the preceding article: both of which were certainly not *above* mediocrity; but the style and language of that now before us, equal any thing to be *heard* in the purlieus of Billingsgate. As to *grammar*, the author seems to be totally ignorant of its plainest rules. Of the *style* and *manner* of this notable production, one sentence will suffice as a specimen.

"As a person dangerous to the happiness and interest of society, I certainly view you; but if you were merely a personal opponent, I should consider you as one of those *animals* which accompany the wretched and miserable

miserable orders of the populace, who can revenge a bite of the creature of their sloth by the strength of their *thumb*, which annihilates the *offender, venom and all, in a crack.*"—(P. 5.)

Is this the *advocate* of a *Prince?*—we should sooner take him for one of Mrs. Fitzherbert's chairmen. It is a trite remark, that an injudicious friend is the worst of enemies; and the converse of the proposition is not less true. From such an adversary, therefore, Mr. Jefferys has little to apprehend. The letters, however, of Mr. Jefferys to Lord Moira, which the former suppressed, and which are here given, certainly strengthen the author's proofs of the charges which he had before adduced against Mr. Jefferys, of endeavouring to extort money from his Royal patron. Indeed the fact is too evident to admit of a doubt. Had these letters been published by themselves, without any of the comments of this writer, their effect would have been much more powerful than it now will be; for it is impossible to read the animadversions on them without disgust. After quoting one of them, the author says:

"The above letter contains the same inconsistency of sentiment which characterize(s) all *the rest of your epistles to the Prince*"—(this letter, be it observed, is addressed to Lord Moira, and not to the Prince).—"One part of it displays the rude language of menace; another part *couches the desires* of an impudent mendicant; and the concluding paragraphs express the feelings of a greedy, ill-tempered, snivelling school-boy, who is crying for every thing he sees, and is in want of nothing but a whipping."

We will not inquire into the truth of the remark; but we must observe, that any school-boy, twelve years old, who should write such wretched nonsense as *this* paragraph exhibits, would certainly receive a whipping, and would most richly deserve it. The rest of the pamphlet, we mean that part of it which relates to the Prince and his jeweller, is absolutely beneath criticism. It is coarse, vulgar, and, in some passages, *beastly* (see p. 13). We shall, therefore, pass to the last part, which relates, exclusively, to Mrs. Fitzherbert. And here, we confess, we are utterly at a loss for words to express our astonishment at a man, who publicly stands forward to plead the cause of *fornication* and *adultery*; for unless such be his meaning, we profess our utter inability to understand him.

That Mr. Jefferys should be attacked, with the utmost virulence, for daring to censure the conduct of the woman in question, affords no subject for surprise. But it is rather surprising to read of the *feelings*, and the *delicacy* of *the nature* of "the esteemed friend of an illustrious personage;" after all that the public know of this mysterious connexion. We shall give a few specimens of the author's mode of treating this delicate subject; by which our readers will be enabled to estimate the validity of his right to the title which he assumes of a *Lover of Truth*.

"When His Royal Highness first courted the acquaintance of Mrs. Fitzherbert, she was a widow lady of independent fortune"—(and therefore had not the usual temptation which indigent circumstances supply to deviate from the paths of virtue),—"and highly esteemed in the circles in which she then moved. Time, and reciprocal attention, to which the warm and delighted minds of lovers naturally give birth"—(we really were ignorant of this striking fact, that lovers' minds are the parents of *time!*),—"endeared them to each other in the strongest bonds of affection."

In

In the next sentence this eloquent panegyrist declares, that he is "satisfied her conduct and situation have greater *claims* to our commiseration and esteem than to the inconsiderate and violent abuse, &c." *Claims* to *abuse*, is a new figure of speech;—but how can this writer talk of *abuse?*—*Clodius accusat mœchos, &c.*—But we proceed with our quotations.

"Are there no feelings in the public bosom"—(Yes, there are, indeed, and very strong feelings too, but of a very different kind from those which appear to predominate in your's, good Sir)—"for the situation of a lady, who was brought from her respectable seat of peaceful retirement into public notice by the alluring hopes of lasting protection, and at a time when her illustrious lover was a free agent, *and not involved in any constitutional courtship?* Consider her for several years as the most affectionate companion of a noble personage, whose constant attention had sealed every promise that could assure to her uninterrupted happiness for life."

The *uninterrupted happiness* of a woman living with a man who was not, who could not be, her husband; and, *consequently*, living in a state of sin! —Pretty notions of religion and morality this scribbler must have!

"I again ask, whether every avenue to the heart is to be shut to the case of this lady, who was suddenly separated from a companion who had *courted her into bondage*"—(we might here very properly exclaim with Richard,

Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
Was ever woman in this humour *won?*
I'll have her, *but I will not keep her long*)—,

"and for years performed *all the duties of the husband*, but who afterwards, in compliance *to* (with) the wish of his father, and the policy of the Cabinet, left the object of his admiration, for *a constitutional marriage* with an Illustrious Princess?"

Here, at least, the author has *spoken out*. He tells us, that the Prince and Mrs. Fitzherbert lived together as husband and wife; now, by the laws of this country, they could not be husband and wife:—what, then, were they? They were just the same as the Duke of Clarence and Mrs. Jordan, or any other man and woman who live together without being married. And yet this writer has the assurance to stand forth the advocate of a woman who could so live, and to proclaim her a fit associate for females of rank and virtue!!! A *constitutional marriage*, as he absurdly calls it, is nothing more than a *lawful* marriage, a marriage celebrated according to the laws of the country. There can be no other *marriage*; and any couple who cohabit together without such marriage, live in a state of *fornication*.

The insinuations against the Princess of Wales, whom the author affects to praise, are alike gross and infamous; but still they become the man who dares insult the public by panegyrizing Mrs. Fitzherbert.

"The candid reader, and a person possessed of any knowledge of *human life*, must allow, that there are many hidden circumstances connected with the married state, of which the delicacy of the marriage-bed precludes an investigation and knowledge, but which are the frequent causes of mysterious *separations* among married people, whose appearance has created general admiration, and produced a public wonder, that such and

such

such a particular couple should have had any cause to disagree after the hymeneal knot had bound them together for life."

However *mysterious* such *separations* may be, of which, however, (being, we suppose, not to be classed among *candid readers*, or persons *possessed of any knowledge of life*), we profess to know nothing; they are certainly not more *mysterious* than the paragraph which we have quoted, which sets our powers of comprehension at defiance.

"Such, however, is the state of the human mind, and such are the physical infirmities of our nature, that a certain indescribable *something* in a male or *female*, will often *chill or increase* our passions and affections beyond the ordinary practices of life.

"Unhappily for the lasting tranquillity of a Royal Couple, there was *a something* which the prying eye of curiosity will never be able to discover, that is understood to have had an unpleasant operation on the mind of an Illustrious Personage.

"If these operations of the mind are considered as incompatible with the pledge of the marriage vow, a surprize might as well be expressed that one female should be known to have a greater ascendancy than another, &c."

We really are at a loss which most to admire, the impudence, or the folly of this apologist for adultery—both of which greatly exceed any thing of the kind that we have met with. Is it to be borne, that the most sacred bond of society, consecrated by the sanction of our Blessed Redeemer himself, and the fertile source of all happiness and virtue, should be publicly treated with this indecent levity by an ignorant parasite, who would fain have the world believe that he is in the confidence of the great? Is a vow the most solemn, made at the altar of God, and in his presence as it were, to be thus lightly regarded as a gamester's promise, or an Atheist's oath, to be broken at the suggestion of interest, lust, or caprice?—Forbid it decency! Forbid it shame!

Insulting as the passages which we have transcribed are to the Princess of Wales, that which follows is still more so.

"I am given to understand from *good authority*, that when His Royal Highness made known to Mrs. Fitzherbert his *want of happiness at home*, she used all the arguments that her enlightened mind could suggest, to dissuade the Prince against a separation from his Illustrious Wife, and her earnest entreaties to reconcile his feelings to the love and esteem of his Royal Consort."

To see a *mistress* exhorting her *paramour* to discharge his *duty* to his *wife*, whom he had sworn at the altar to *love* and to *cherish*, "and, forsaking all other, keep only unto her, so long as they both shall live;" is a new picture of fashionable life, which any man of common decency would studiously have concealed from the public eye.

"Mrs. Fitzherbert also felt for the *honour of her own pride*"—(had she felt the pride of *virtue* it had been rather more becoming),—"and refused for a considerable time His Royal Highness's request"—('by keeping men off you lead them on'),—"in many *honourable* letters"—(what a horrible prostitution of words!) "in which she expressed her reluctance to give any pain to Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales"—(so that, a sense of virtue, it seems, had no share in dictating the refusal!)—"I am

—"I am certain this *insulted* Lady made every endeavour to soften the mind of His Royal Highness into a renewal of his matrimonial affection."

We know not which is most glaring in this passage, the insult to the Princess, or the libel on the Prince.

"After, however, every endeavour and argument on her part would not avail, and His Royal Highness repeatedly expressed his determination not to *wear any chains* that abridged his happiness;"—(the *seventh* commandment, however, is a *chain* which Princes, as well as peasants, *must wear*, or else abide by the dreadful consequences of breaking it!)—"Mrs. Fitzherbert was at last *forced* into a promise of her society, by all the entreaties that could come from the accomplished mind of an elegant and Illustrious Gentleman.

"I now beg leave to observe, that under all these circumstances Mrs. Fitzherbert was placed in a situation in which I scarcely know where to find a woman who had possessed the affections of the Prince for eight years, that would not have returned to the object of her esteem"—Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coute.—"On the one hand, there appeared a determination in His Royal Highness to seek happiness away from his Royal Bed,"—and this is the man who so strongly reprobates Mr. Jefferys for his attempts to degrade the Prince in the eye of the public! He must either be deeply versed in hypocrisy, or destitute of common sense; "and, on the other hand, the above Lady was *well assured*, that if she had persisted to refuse, or had not been in existence, there was no probability of a reconciliation in another quarter."

And this he seems seriously to think a complete and satisfactory justification of the woman, whose defence he has so judiciously undertaken, and so eloquently pleaded! This, he gravely intimates, will confute "a thousand illiberal constructions, which have been put on the conduct of this Lady, who has undeservedly met with the most wanton slander;" and, no doubt, he will be greatly surprized when we, as seriously, tell him, that he has slandered, or at least exposed her more wantonly and more completely than Mr. Jefferys, or than any of her enemies. Our readers, we are sure, will concur with us in this opinion. He abuses Mr. Jefferys for deprecating the effects of admitting a woman, who has notoriously deviated from the paths of virtue, into the society of virtuous women. But he evidently does not understand the nature of the objection. He does not perceive that the consequence to be deplored is not the contamination of the morals of such virtuous females, by the obscene discourse of the person so admitted, but the example so set, by breaking down those barriers which, in every Christian society, separate virtue from vice. Thus all his observations, were they as forcible as many of them are futile, are irrelevant to the subject. They afford him, however, an opportunity, of which he most eagerly avails himself, for daubing over his brazen idol with the thickest plaister of adulation—*ex. gr.*

"No lady has a more perfect knowledge of what constitutes the pure mirth of refined society than Mrs. Fitzherbert; and I defy any one to say, that she ever converted her personal charms and accomplishments *to any use* that would *withdraw* the *mind* from those moral and religious principles which are the distinguishing characteristics of a British people, and the Corinthian pillar of their liberty and happiness."—We will not insult

insult our readers by a single comment upon this passage, nor yet cloy them with any more of our author's *beauties*.

Had he confined himself to a defence of the Prince of Wales against the aspersions of his jeweller, and moderated the asperity of his language, which might easily have been done without diminishing its force, he would have been entitled to praise for the design, whatever might have been said of the execution. But, here, he has transgressed all bounds of moderation and decency, disgusted every rational reader, and injured the cause which he meant to serve. We will not, for a moment, suppose, that the respectable Nobleman whose name is so often introduced,—much less the Prince of Wales,—gave his sanction to the publication of this pamphlet;—we will not libel him by such an imputation; but the Prince's friends will do well to restrain the officious zeal of advocates, who fall themselves into the very errors which they condemn in others. Our respect for His Royal Highness,—whom we wish to see an object of reverence to all the subjects of his father,—leads us deeply to deplore the appearance of this "Diamond new Pointed," which can only cut those whom it was designed to protect.

A Vindication of Mr. Jefferys, and his Pamphlet against the Prince of Wales; with Remarks on the Patriot's Review of the above Pamphlet, and (of) *all the Pamphlets which have been published in reply to it.* By Diogenes. 8vo. Pr. 24. 1s. 6d. Prince. 1806.

WITHOUT impeaching the *motives* of this writer, and giving him implicit credit for his disinterestedness, we must observe, that his Vindication is supported by assertion, and not by argument. In order to make it appear that Jefferys *may have* lost a large sum by the Prince of Wales, he puts an *Imaginary* case; supposes him to have made contracts, under certain penalties, which the non-payment of his demand by the Prince, to its utmost extent, disabled him from fulfilling! In answer to the observation, that Jefferys was ruined by his own extravagance, which undoubtedly was the fact, he says, "Jefferys was led to do all this through the Prince." He goes still farther, and thinks Jefferys fully justified in *anticipating* the great fortune which he *inferred* from the Prince's *smiles!* We suspect that Mr. Jefferys's creditors will not admit the validity of such logic. In truth, this is a very contemptible production; professing what it does not perform.

Diogenes asserts that all the writers against Jefferys are *hired* to calumniate him; and that the author of "A Letter to Nathaniel Jefferys," is a well-known member of the London Corresponding Society; who was formerly one of its travelling delegates, and also one of its most clamorous orators in the vicinity of the metropolis. Of this we know nothing; we consider the *books*, and not the *authors*; and, as we suspected, we have not yet read one upon the subject which we have not been compelled to censure.

Substance of the Debates on a Resolution for abolishing the Slave-Trade, which was moved in the House of Commons on the 10th June, 1806; and in the House of Lords on the 24th June, 1806. With an Appendix, containing Notes and Illustrations. Crown 8vo. Pp. 216. Phillips and Fardon. 1806.

THE advocates for the abolition of the slave-trade, including all the sectaries and pseudo-philanthropists in the kingdom (together, certainly, with many very respectable characters), are too active and persevering in their efforts, to suffer any opportunity to escape, for improving the advantage which they obtained in the last session of Parliament. Such is the object of the present publication, which is *embellished* with a representation, no doubt very *accurate*, of the inside of a slave-ship. When *humanity* and *justice* go hand in hand, it is all very well; but the Parliament, in voting the abolition of this trade, should, at least, have recollected, that men had been led to embark their capitals in the cultivation of our colonies, by the encouragement repeatedly holden out by the Legislature itself to the pursuit of this very commerce, without which, they contend, the colonies must be ruined. Justice, therefore, imperatively required, that full indemnification should be made to our colonists, for the losses which they should sustain, in consequence of what they consider as a gross breach of parliamentary faith.

The *notes* on some of the speeches betray less judgment than zeal, and still less ability than either. In one of them, on Lord Grenville's speech, it is asserted, that no proof has ever been adduced of the truth of the assertion, that the African chiefs put their prisoners to death. This is false; proofs have been adduced. If this annotater be disposed to look for them, we will abridge his labour by referring him to the *History of Dahomy*. As to the speeches themselves, they exhibit a motley mixture of sound argument and senseless declamation.

A Treatise on Practical Navigation and Seamanship; with Directions for the Management of a Ship in all Situations; and also a full and accurate Description of the English Channel, with distinct and clear Directions for its Navigation from the Downs Westward, and from its Entrance to the Downs; the Result of actual and laborious Surveys, during Sixty-four Years of constant Service. By the late Wm. Nichelson, Esq. Master-Attendant of Chatham Dock-yard, and a Governor of the Chest at Chatham, &c. &c. Pp. 364. 8vo. 8s. Mawman. 1806.

TO a posthumous work we always turn with indulgence, convinced that the writer who has paid the debt of nature cannot then profit by our remarks, still less will he again transgress on the public, by increasing that alarming evil—a multitude of useless or pernicious books. To an author also like the present, the valuable fruits of whose long experience and skill have been advantageously communicated to the public from time to time, it would not only be ungenerous, but even ungrateful to pronounce a stern condemnation of the errors or defects of his last work.—From the actual editor of this volume, however, some more respect was due to its author, and he should at least have told us ingenuously, whether it has received the author's last corrections, or whether it is only

manufactured

manufactured from his quarto volume on the same subject. The latter, indeed, is but too apparent. We also expected that a brief notice of the author's useful life would have accompanied this volume. Notwithstanding, we cannot hesitate to say, that it will be very acceptable, in its present form, to our British seamen, as it abounds in remarks which every seafaring man will immediately discover to be the result of much experience and good sense—the greatest possible merit for such a work.

The editor very properly introduces this Treatise on Practical Navigation and Seamanship, with a Dissertation, occupying forty-two pages, on the Winds. As it is not to be supposed that reviewers are *practical* seamen, or that they are as well acquainted with managing the helm, and reefing or unreefing sails, as with the astronomical and geographical causes which operate in producing the winds, we of course rejoiced to find that he had entered on a subject in which, perhaps, our rather more extensive knowledge of theory, and that too with experience sufficient to rectify preceding speculations, placed us more immediately on a level with our author, than in the other parts of this work. We have to regret that Mr. N. should have adopted a phraseology in this Introduction so antiquated, as to pass for a production of the early part of the seventeenth century, instead of the nineteenth. He has also followed Dr. Halley with apparently much more zeal, than that with which he has observed and noted facts in the course of his own extensive experience. Nevertheless some original and important observations are scattered throughout this Treatise, most of which tend to improve our skill in practical seamanship, and to instruct masters and commanders of vessels, in cases of violent storms, or sudden squalls, to anticipate and guard against their fatal effects in the management of their vessels. After the example of most writers, Mr. N. begins his view of the principal winds as depending on the course of the sun. The following are the chief subjects of discussion:—Of the perpetual Easterly Winds; of the Westerly Winds at the Equator; of the North and South Winds; of the Sun's Influence on the Trade Winds; Calms under the Equator; of the Two Degrees from the 28th to the 30th of either Latitude, being the Shifting Line of the Winds from the East to the West; of the Winds from 30 to 50 of either Latitude, which, while the Sun is in the Northern Hemisphere, are generally from West to South-West, but while it is in the Southern Hemisphere they are generally from West to North West.—These perpetual westerly winds, from the 30th to the 50th degree of latitude in both hemispheres, according to our author, are occasioned partly by their paralleleity to the trade winds, and partly by the sun's declination. The influence of the Arabian Sea on the south and north-western monsoons, and the exceptions which Dr. Halley has remarked as opposed to the general easterly winds, are also cursorily considered. Here the author alludes to his former descriptions of the Monsoons in the Indian and Chinese Seas. In the English Channel the prevailing winds are south-west, west to north-west during eight months in the year.—These winds take their rise on the Coast of North America and Newfoundland, and traverse the Atlantic Ocean, the south-west prevailing most in summer, and the north-west in winter. Northerly and southerly winds are partial, and prevail only occasionally from the Coast of Ireland to the Bay of Biscay; but from Cape Finisterre to Lisbon and Cape St. Vincent's, and thence to Madeira and the Canary Islands, the prevailing winds

winds are north and north-east nine months in the year. The easterly winds prevail on the Coasts of England generally without intermission in the latter end of September and all October; and in the latter end of March, and all April, particularly the latter.

Our author concludes his observations on the general Theory of the Winds, by urging particular attention to what he deems an original and important fact, of the highest consequence to the prudent management of a ship, especially during squally weather, which is, that the wind often blows perpendicular upon the water, and that it is this perpendicular wind which frequently destroys the sails and rigging of ships at sea. We have no doubt of the author's accuracy in stating these frequent downright blasts, which prevail most off capes and head lands, as at the Land's End, off Brest, the Bay of Biscay, Finisterre, Cape St. Vincent's, and in the Mediterranean; but we cannot subscribe to his mode of accounting for it, or that it is this particular kind of wind only which occasions waves in the sea. It is enough, indeed, for the author to have ascertained the fact, and instructed seamen how to guard against its fatal consequences; its origin and progress falls more immediately in the sphere of the philosopher, than the practical navigator. Different causes will doubtless be given to explain this phenomenon, in the mean time we consider that the following facts satisfactorily and simply account for this occurrence.—Currents of air at sea always travel in right lines (a circumstance, we believe, not noticed by philosophers, nor practical navigators), and for want of resisting and decomposing bodies, as at land, never mix, but continue their course until they again arrive on some shore, or at the equator, where they are generally incorporated or absorbed. Such currents pass over and under each other in all directions, according to their respective velocities and gravities, and frequently do not occupy a space of double the dimensions of a ship of war. At the intersections of these currents and counter-currents, being elastic bodies, they reciprocally yield, and in that act produce the oblique, or downward deflection, which our author justly considers so dangerous to vessels, and which he erroneously supposes to be the consequence of the atmosphere's tendency to the earth's centre. To this particular action of atmospherical currents may be ascribed the cause of whirlwinds and water-spouts at sea; and also that of sudden squalls and tempests after a calm.

After many directions and judicious observations, which will still be useful to most of our coasting traders, for passing up and down the Channel, the author concludes the volume by an interesting narrative of the voyages of His Majesty's ships Grafton, from Halifax to England in 1757, and Elizabeth, from India to England in 1764; in both of which our author's nautical skill and mechanical genius were successfully employed in situations the most perilous that can be believed possible to terminate happily. Both these vessels lost their rudders very shortly after putting to sea, and both had machines constructed as substitutes for this indispensable instrument by Mr. N. The particular structure of this guiding apparatus, as well as the perilous situation of the ships, are illustrated by well executed plates, the same as the 4to. edition. The directions to officers in such deplorable occasions are extremely judicious, and leave no doubt, that did the captains and crews of vessels always retain their presence of mind, they could in many cases preserve their lives, and bring their vessels safe into

port. Unfortunately it too often happens that one severe accident so far paralyzes, not only the sailors, but even the officers and captain himself, that all attempts afterwards to save themselves are treated with contempt. To obviate this misfortune, it is unquestionable if our Admiralty would offer rewards and honours to all seamen who should evince great presence of mind in such trying occasions, that the number of shipwrecks might still be considerably diminished. In unison with this desirable object, we might also mention the utility of obliging all Masters in the Navy, a class of men at present very little occupied, to keep barometrical and thermometrical registers of the weather and the winds, and collect facts relative to the period and duration of certain winds in every navigable latitude, in order to form a general system, which perhaps would be no less useful to the progress of navigation, than a more accurate knowledge of the longitude, which has so long been a desideratum, and on which so much money has been expended. In this respect, the ingenious and scientific labours of Captain Flinders, on the Coast of New Holland, merit the highest praise.

Although this Treatise on Practical Navigation is destined for the use of all sea-faring men, it is not interlarded with much technical phraseology; on the contrary, the directions for the management of a ship, her sails and rigging, &c. are conveyed in such a miscellaneous manner, as all well-educated landmen, who have ever seen a ship, may perfectly comprehend.

Admonitory Hints on the Use of Sea-Bathing. By J. Peake, M. R. C. Surgeons, London, and Author of a Candid Review of the New Opinions of the late John Hunter, &c. 8vo. Pp. 44. 1s. 6d. Burgess, Ramsgate; Rivingtons, London. 1806.

MR. PEAKE is a surgeon resident at Ramsgate, and has therefore had ample opportunity for qualifying himself, by personal observation, to speak with decision, on the precautions necessary to be adopted by persons who wish to have recourse to sea-bathing. Certainly, the indiscriminate use of the sea-bath is highly improper, and must be productive of material injury. No individual, therefore, should rashly venture upon it; nor, indeed, without previously taking medical advice.

The object of Mr. Peake, as stated by himself, is to supply "a Manual or Pocket Companion as a caveat against the indiscriminate use of sea-bathing," and as such it will answer very well, as the hints which it contains are judicious and useful. But, as it was intended, not for professional men, but for the general frequenters of watering-places, it would assuredly have been more useful had it been more intelligible. Can the great majority of this description of persons, possibly understand the meaning of such expressions as these—"Diathesis,"—"a *sizezess* in the circulating fluids, requiring the action of stimulants to attenuate, propel, and urge their defective energy;"—"sthenic effects,"—"the viscera,"—"Hemeplegy, Dispepsy,"—"Plethora,"—"the exhaustion of sensorial power or too free action of a stimulus, and e contra relaxants,"—"the alvine discharge,"—"menorrhagea,"—"asthenic diseases,"—"nephritic complaints,"—"desquamations on the skin,"—"Idiosyncracy,

"Idiosyncrasy of the constitution,"—*cum multis aliis ejusdem generis.* All this is, to say the least of it, abominable affectation;—a miserable display of learning (such as it is) woefully misplaced. But when a man affects to be learned, he ought to take special care to be correct; and not, like Mr. Peake, commit *grammatical* blunders, and even *orthographical* errors. For instance;—"valetudinare (i) an,"—p. 2.—"exhile (a) rate,"—p. 3.—"e (i) nvigorate,"—p. 3.—"a size (i) ness,"—p. 9.—"loose" for lose, p. 13.—"occur (r) ing," p. 28. So much for his orthographical accuracy—now, for an instance or too of his grammatical correctness.—"A feeble enervated habit *who* (which) sought relief," p. 10.—"Epilepsy is of this genus, and if occurring before puberty be cured like most of this class if combined with tonic remedies, as well as that convulsive complaint called St. Vitus's dance," p. 28. This is a complete and distinct paragraph; for an explanation of the meaning of which we shall feel much indebted to any of our *learned* correspondents.

More Miseries: addressed to the Morbid, the Melancholy, and the Unstable. By Sir Fretful Murmur, Knt. 12mo. Pp. 176. Symonds, Matthews, and Leigh. 1806.

SUCH is the nature of mankind, that those who, from the blessings of fortune and constitution, are exempted from the real evils of life, will conjure up imaginary forms of evil to make themselves miserable: from this cause it is that we are warranted in saying, the cup of good and evil is more equally mixed than is generally imagined. A man who has suffered the greatest possible loss, that of fortune and friends, with a mind firm enough to struggle through the difficulties of life, and humble enough to submit without repining to the decrees of an all-wise Providence, may be happier than one who, possessing every worldly advantage, is troubled with that morbid sensibility, which converts the most trifling inconveniencies into serious evils.

This is the continuation of a little volume that was lately published, but to which we think it much superior. We lay these specimens of minor evils before our readers.

"Reading an interesting book by a small wax taper, which is in want of constant elevation."

"Being conducted by an enthusiastic agriculturist round an extensive farm, having no taste whatever for the breeding of sheep, fattening pigs, new-invented draining and thrashing machines, &c."

"Calling upon a couple of *dear domestic friends*, and never finding them at home."

We apprehend this is oftener thought a blessing: for the following being one we can vouch from experience.

"Snuffing the candle for a lady, who is in the middle of a difficult sonata of Viotti, out; only one candle."

The following we think rather beyond a minor evil:

"Being nervous, and cross-examined by Mr. Garrow."

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE REVEREND DR. GLEIG, AND MR. MALCOLM LAING.

HAVING lately cast our eyes over some numbers of the *Monthly Magazine* we observed, in one of them, a Letter from Mr. Malcolm Laing of Edinburgh, to the Editor, in which that gentleman complains of "the Shameful Prostitution of our Literary Journals to the purposes of private animosity and personal abuse;" and mentions particularly, as one of this description, the ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW. But before we comment on his assertions, we shall lay his Letter before our readers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

"Sir, I request the insertion of the following observations in your Monthly Magazine, as the most effectual mode of appeal to the public, upon a subject not uninteresting to men of letters, who may have suffered from the SHAMEFUL PROSTITUTION of our Literary journals to the purposes of PRIVATE ANIMOSITY and PERSONAL ABUSE.

"In consequence of my frequent absence from Edinburgh last summer, I had not occasion, till very lately, to examine the Review of the second edition of my History of Scotland in the British Critic for March, April, May, and June, 1805. In this appeal, I can have no inclination to enter into a literary dispute with the anonymous author of that article, whose knowledge of the controversy respecting Mary Queen of Scots, is confined to the writings of Tytler and Whitaker, who quotes Goodall through the medium of Whitaker, and who asserts as a fact, that 'the Queen's letters and sonnets to Bothwell have *long been abandoned as palpable forgeries* * *by her enemies*, as well as by her friends.' But the following passages, among many others, in which I am directly charged with the fabrication of facts, with misquotation and falsehood, are too serious in their consequences to that journal, as well as to myself, to be overlooked or treated with silent contempt.

"'We are there told that, on the same day on which her husband was buried, Mary conferred on Durham, the servant who had deserted or be-

---

* "I have since obtained a document that brings the controversy to a short and decisive issue. The argument against the authenticity of the letters is, that the French edition being a translation, the letters were originally forged in Scotch, and both editions were published in London under Cecil's inspection. The argument for the authenticity of the letters is, that the French edition is professedly a translation printed by the Huguenots at Rochelle, but that the Scotch is evidently a translation from a French original now lost, and of which a few initial lines prefixed to each letter are alone preserved. In consequence of the late change in administration, I have obtained a transcript from the State-paper office, of a copy of one of Mary's letters to Bothwell in the original French, essentially different from the French translation printed at Rochelle, and evidently the original from which the Scotch is translated."

trayed

frayed him, a place about the person of her son; and on the Earl of Bothwell the reversion of the feudal superiority of Leith. But Robertson, the only author referred to for these facts, says not one word of Durham's treachery and reward; from which circumstance *some judgment may be formed of Mr. Laing's accuracy in making quotations.* The story of Durham we believe to be a *falsehood*, without even the *shadow of foundation*; for were it a *fact*, the author would surely have known where he found it. 'This is really *pushing the advocate too far.*'—*British Critic*, vol. xxix. p. 491.

"Again, 'That Lethington's wife was so ready a writer, that in one night she could copy all the letters, is in the highest degree incredible; and Mr. L.'s *confused appeal to Murdin and the State Trials*, for the *truth* of this extraordinary fact, will not have *much weight* with those who have *carefully attended to his mode of quotation.*'—*Id.* 633.

"And again, 'This is a very *extraordinary assertion.* We have *carefully consulted Lesly*, and find in him nothing that even the most *perverse ingenuity* can construe into a tacit acknowledgment of the authenticity of the letters.'—*Ibid.*

"These charges are the more serious, as an historian, in matters of fact at least, ought to consider himself as a witness in a court of justice; and an historian, destitute of veracity, is justly exposed to something worse than contempt. In the first instance that is given, I had observed that 'on the same day that her husband was buried, she conferred on Durham, the servant who *had deserted* or *betrayed* him, a place about the person of her son, together with a pension; and on Bothwell, the reversion of the feudal superiority of Leith;' for which last fact alone the authority was quoted.—*Dissert.* I. 49. An impartial or inattentive reader might suppose that the authority for the first fact had been omitted by accident. A more attentive reader would have recurred to the instance that *had been already given*, of Durham's treachery in deserting or betraying his master, for an explanation of the reward; or would have searched the index at least, for a reference to the fact. But when I purposely forbore to overload the page with superfluous quotations so recently introduced, I certainly did not imagine that a British Critic would overlook or choose to forget a passage, which he must have read a few pages before, (p. 33), when, after a minute explanation of Durham's treachery to his master, and his reward from Mary, I observe particularly, in a note of some length, 'And on Saturday the 15th, when the king was buried, this porter of Darnley was appointed, by the Queen's signature, master of the wardrobe to the young Prince for life, with a yearly salary of an hundred pounds Scots.'—*Privy Seal Record Book*, 86, f. 15. '*From which circumstance some judgment may be formed of Mr. Laing's accuracy in making quotations.*'

"In the second instance, viz. 'Mr. L.'s confused appeal to Murdin and the State Trials,' I had bestowed six sentences on a series of facts contained in Bishop Lesly's confession in Murdin, and concluding with the substance of a letter from Lethington to Mary, in which he informs her, among other things, that he had sent her a copy of her letters transcribed by his wife. For these facts, and for the quotation which I have given of Lethington's letter, *Murdin*, p. 52, is distinctly referred to at the end of the sixth sentence, and is the only authority appealed to in the note.—*Dissert.* I. 145. In the sixteenth sentence I pro-

ceed to a quotation upon the same subject, from Barram the Queen's (Elizabeth's) Sergeant's speech, upon Norfolk's trial; and in order not to interrupt the argument, the remainder of the passage is inserted in a separate note, with a distinct reference to *State Trials*, I. 92, for the whole quotation. Whether Lethington's wife had copied the whole, or a part only of the letters, is not the question, but whether these two references are sufficiently distinct. But this anonymous writer did not consult, and had never seen, either Murdin or the State Trials, when, in order to maintain the impossibility of Lethington's wife copying eight letters, (amounting altogether to 570 lines, or about twenty pages) in one night, he chose to affirm, that *Mr. L.'s confused appeal to Murdin and the State Trials, for the truth of this extraordinary fact, will not have much weight with those who have carefully attended to his mode of quotation.*

" In the third instance I had observed, that the Duke of Norfolk having informed Lesly that he had seen the letters, 'whereby there would be such matter proved against his mistress as would dishonour her for ever,' &c. 'Instead of attempting to disabuse the Duke, or to persuade him that the letters were entirely a forgery, Lesly tacitly acknowledges their authenticity; and proposed a device of Lethington's, that the Queen should ratify her former resignation of the crown,' &c. p. 151. At the end of the sentence, *Murdin*, 53, containing Lesly's confession, which I had repeatedly quoted, and to which Hume (vol. v. note, L. 13), and Robertson, *Dissert. on K. Henry's Murder*, have both appealed for the same fact, is again distinctly referred to, as the sole authority for every quotation, incident, or inference comprehended in the preceding part of the paragraph. But instead of consulting the authority to which I did appeal, this anonymous reviewer, who had never seen either Murdin or the State Trials, which contain the same confession, consults an authority to which I did not appeal; in order to affirm, that *for this very extraordinary assertion he can find in* LESLY (whose defence of Mary he has carefully consulted!) *nothing that the most* PERVERSE INGENUITY *can construe into a tacit acknowledgment of the authenticity of the letters.*

" These are but slight and inconsiderable specimens of the review itself, so different from the general tenor even of the British Critic, and prolonged for upwards of fifty pages, filled throughout with the most calumnious insinuations against my character and credit as an historian, and with the most indecent and scurrilous allusions to my profession as an advocate. Since the author however in those instances in which he has charged me with the fabrication of facts, with misquotation and falshood, has chosen to stake his veracity in opposition to mine; and since he has signified in his correspondence with Mr. Nares upon the subject, that 'he declines at present to be made known,' I shall proceed to detect and state his former malignity in other journals, but without announcing his name to the world.

" The first time that I ever heard of him was in May, 1800, when a RETRACTION *and* APOLOGY *concerning the* MACGREGORS appeared in the Monthly Magazine. The author, *a copious writer in the Anti-Jacobin Magazine and Review*, had very artfully transmitted to the Monthly Magazine for August, 1799, a libel against the Macgregors and the Clan Alpin regiment, under the fictitious signature of *Gregor Macnab*. At first he denied all knowledge of the libel with such bold and solemn protestations

testations of his own innocence, and of his inviolable respect for the clan and name of Macgregor, as could not well be disbelieved; especially as the only motive that could ever be discovered for this unprovoked aggression was, his secret animosity towards an officer who had refused to dismiss a recruit at his request. When the manuscript, however, was procured, and produced against him in a court of justice, his hand-writing appeared to be so indisputable, that as he was prosecuted at the same time for another libel in the Edinburgh Magazine of the same month, (August, 1799) he chose to submit to the apology attested and inserted by an English clergyman, a friend of his own, in the Monthly Magazine for May, 1800, and referred to in this letter as an ample confirmation of the present statement, and as a proof that HE IS UTTERLY DISQUALIFIED FOR THE OFFICE OF A REVIEWER.

"The first edition of my History of Scotland was published in June or July thereafter, and *in the Anti-Jacobin Magazine of the following year it was reviewed in a strain of such gross abuse as exceeded even the customary style for which that review is so peculiarly distinguished.* The work contained certain historical and uncontrovertible facts concerning the Macgregors, written so early as the beginning of the year 1793, before I had heard of any recent attempt to revive the clan, or of any individual of note who had resumed the name. The publication of these historical facts, when compared to the recent humiliating recantation of a libel, and the general tenor of the history itself, were considered it seems as sufficient provocations; and a long parade of authorities taken from the Encyclopædia Britannica, marked the writer as distinctly as if his name had been annexed to the article.

"In my subsequent Dissertation respecting Mary Queen of Scots, I was content with intimating in a note, and in a manner intelligible only to the reviewer himself, that I understood sufficiently both his name and character; being satisfied that his animosity would soon betray him into some new indiscretion. Accordingly, on perusing the article in question in the British Critic, I immediately recognized, though with some surprize, my old and almost-forgotten acquaintance Gregor Macnab. *On his quarrel with the Anti-Jacobin*, his pen has been entirely devoted to the British Critic. The coarseness of his invectives was somewhat corrected; but his malevolence was the same as formerly. His allusions to my history were also the same; and an allusion in particular to Lord Banff's bribe in the Scottish parliament, repeated in the British Critic (p. 491), almost *verbatim* from the Anti-Jacobin (X. 145), renders the identity of the author indisputable. But the following passage respecting a manuscript which I had deposited in the Advocate's Library, affords a convincing detection of the author, whose name the editors of the British Critic 'would be proud to avow,' but which he himself is so unwilling to reveal.

"'We have indeed been *informed* by a very *competent judge*, by whom at our request it (the manuscript) was *examined with some care*, that it is a thing of very little value, appearing to be a collection of the reports of the day, with as little discrimination as is usually to be found in a Newspaper.'—*British Critic*, p. 396.

"This manuscript, the original of Crawford's spurious Memoirs, was published at Whitaker's desire, within a few weeks after my history

under the title of the Historie and Life of King James the Sext: and a very different account of its merits will be found in the oldest and most respectable of our literary journals, the Monthly Review for December last. But the manuscript has never been communicated to any, except to two gentlemen, either before or since it was published; and in this fact there can be no mistake. Unless when communicated to them, it remained in my own possession till published: the librarians assure me that it never was lent or shewn to any but to these gentlemen; and no correspondent in Edinburgh, much less a *competent judge*, employed to examine it at the reviewer's *request*, could have been ignorant, or have failed to inform him, that it was already published, and that the book was to be procured in every bookseller's shop. But of those gentlemen to whom alone it had been communicated, the one, whose opinion of the manuscript is the very reverse of the preceding, gave no information whatsoever of its contents. The other, one of our *judges*, to whom I had lent the manuscript for Mr. Whitaker's information, and by whom it was certainly examined with some care, very frankly acknowledged to me, that in the interval between the publication of my history, and of the manuscript, of which this reviewer was ignorant, I had *either mentioned* or transmitted by letter, *he recollects not which*, the precise *opinion** quoted above from the British Critic, to an episcopal clergyman at some distance from Edinburgh, formerly a nonjuring or jacobite clergyman, and better known as the author of a libel against the Macgregors, under the fictitious signature of Gregor Macnab.

"As the preceding statement has never once been contradicted by Mr. N. in our correspondence upon the subject, and as I know for certain that this author has been admitted for some years past as a writer in that journal, it remains for the editors to determine whether he is entitled to act as a reviewer, and to continue as such in the British Critic or not. If in their opinion he ought not to continue, I am perfectly satisfied; and as for the insult offered to my character, and to my credit as an historian, I ask no reparation or apology whatsoever. If on the contrary it is the opinion of the editors that he ought to continue as their co-adjutor and correspondent in the British Critic, it is proper that the public should also be informed, that their review is to be rendered subservient, as formerly, to his lurking malignity, and a vehicle for his private, political, or literary animosities, and for the most personal abuse. A Review is a secret, self-created tribunal, to which authors of every description are made amenable; and in proportion to the confidence reposed in it by an indulgent public, a faithful and conscientious discharge of the trust is requisite. But the public will be at no loss to determine, whether an author, capable and convicted by his own confession, of uttering libels

---

* "The words in Italics are his Lordship's corrections; but the information was undoubtedly transmitted by letter. Having communicated *by letter* as he fairly acknowledged, his opinion of my Dissertation, viz. That it contained little or nothing but what Hume or Robertson had produced upon the subject, he would necessarily add in the same letter his opinion of the manuscript as the only addition to what was contained in Hume and Robertson."

under

under a fictitious signature, ought to sit in judgment upon men of letters; or what degree of credit is due to a journal in which he is suffered to vent his malignity against their productions, under the form and disguise of a just, impartial, and candid review. The public will also perceive, that my motive is not to enter into an idle controversy with an unknown reviewer, but to exempt myself and others from the repetition of similar insults and abuse: and the editors have themselves only to blame if, from their connexion with this writer, the British Critic should suffer in the public estimation. Knowing the advantage that I possessed, I have acted openly and fairly, and I trust not vindictively towards them, when the full extent of the outrage is considered; and as the statement contained in this letter has remained in your hands uncontradicted, since the 31st of March, it is not incumbent upon me to reply to the British Critic, much less to the author of the RETRACTION *and* APOLOGY *concerning the* MACGREGORS. I am, Sir, &c.

Edinburgh, April 25, 1806. MALCOLM LAING."

How Mr. Laing has discovered that Dr. Gleig was "a copious writer in the Anti-Jacobin," we know not; certainly, we had never any communication with him on that, or on any other subject; and we would advise him, for his own sake, to investigate closely, and to reflect seriously, before he decides so authoritatively. We are not about to satisfy his curiosity in that respect;—but when he asserts that our Review is peculiarly distinguished for its gross abuse, we must take leave to tell him, that he says the thing which is not; our sentiments respecting his notable production were expressed with that force and with that freedom which the occasion seemed not merely to justify, but to prescribe; and nothing which he has urged in his own defence has produced the smallest alteration in them.—He may rest assured, however, that we are as little disposed to *abuse* the living as to calumniate the dead; and while we have the happiness to enjoy the good opinion of some of the ablest and of the best men in this country, we care but little what Mr. Malcolm Laing may *think* of us;—though we will not suffer him to *print* untruths respecting us, without giving him a formal contradiction. As to our *quarrel* with Dr. Gleig, it must have been a quarrel of a most singular nature, since we never heard of its existence till apprized of it by this communicative gentleman. In short, it is a fabrication of his own. It is somewhat strange, that he should have hazarded such an assertion, at a time when he professed to take up the pen to vindicate himself against some imputations which had been cast on his veracity. If he be in the habit of writing thus loosely, we shall cease to be surprized at many of the passages in his History of Scotland. As to Dr. Gleig, he is a gentleman alike estimable for the variety and extent of his knowledge, for the solidity, and, much more, for the *application* of his talents, for the soundness of his religious, moral, and political principles, and for the excellence of his private character. Such of his publications as have fallen under our cognizance are highly honourable to his feelings and to his understanding; his constant and zealous efforts in support of religious and social order, entitle him to the warmest support of the true friends of the country; and, in our estimation, give him the strongest claim for notice and reward on the government.—Entertaining these sentiments of Dr. Gleig, which, when thus stimulated,

stimulated, we feel it a duty to proclaim, our readers will easily believe, that we have not had any quarrel with him, nor are we likely to have any. The *British Critics* may justly be proud of such an associate, whose abilities could not fail to do honour to any literary journal in which they might be employed.—On the immediate subject of discussion between the historian and his critic, we shall leave the latter to speak for himself.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

"Sir, through the medium of your Magazine for the last month, Mr. Laing, of Edinburgh, has appealed to the public from the judgment of the British Critic, on the second edition of his 'History of Scotland;' and in that appeal has taken it for granted that I am the critic, by whom he supposes himself to have been injured. As he has thought proper to make a wanton, and, as I shall prove by and bye, a most unprovoked attack on my moral character, a regard for justice will, of course, induce you to give a place, in the Magazine for this month, to my counter-appeal to the same tribunal. I might indeed disdain to make any reply to a letter in which my name is not once mentioned, but Mr. Laing has clandestinely traduced my character to my friends both in London and in Edinburgh, and so described me in what he calls his *appeal*, that *they* at least cannot mistake the person whom he wishes to render infamous and odious.

"That I am responsible for the arguments urged in the "British Critic" against the conclusions which Mr. Laing labours to establish concerning the murder of Darnley, I readily acknowledge; and I should without hesitation or dread acknowledge *every review* that I have written for *that*, or *any other journal*, did not my wretched hand-writing, and my distance from the press, render it impossible for me to prevent such typographical errors, as sometimes alter the meaning, and not unfrequently deprive of all meaning, the sentences in which they occur.

"Let not this be understood as an *apology* for any thing offensive to Mr. Laing in the review of his Dissertation. That review, though not entirely free from such errors as I have mentioned, is on the whole correctly printed (as indeed the "British Critic" generally is), and I hope to convince your readers that nothing to be found in it stands in need of any apology. Mr. Laing objects but to three passages of the review, though he says, and says truly, that there are many others *equally* objectionable; and therefore if I vindicate these three, I trust that the public will give me credit for being equally able to vindicate those others, whenever he may choose to call them in question.

"The first passage to which he objects is quoted in page 517, and replied to in page 518, of your Magazine; and as it is quoted with tolerable fairness, I shall not here quote it again; but only request the reader to observe, that the *fact* in question is *not*, "whether, on the day on which the King was buried, the Queen conferred on Durham *a place* about the person of her son, together with *a pension*.' About this fact, as it is a matter of no importance, I am not aware that there has ever been a controversy. The questions at issue between Mr. Laing and me are, "Whether Durham was *particularly accused* of having *betrayed his master*, and the Queen *believed* to have conferred on him the place and pension as *a reward for his treachery*?' To render it, as I thought, impossible

sible to mistake the facts which I called in question, I directed the words *deserted or betrayed*, as well as the words *treachery* and *reward*, to be printed in Italic characters; and in these characters they were accordingly printed in the 'British Critic,' though not in your Magazine. But neither the privy-seal record quoted by Mr. Laing, in the thirty-third page of his Dissertation, nor Dr. Robertson, referred to for the same facts in the forty-ninth page, says one word of Durham's *treachery* or *reward*; whilst Herbert, or French Paris, in his second declaration, represents the Queen as, some time before the King's murder, having *no confidence whatever in Durham*; and Mr. Laing himself in page 276, vol. ii. expressly acquits Durham of that very treachery, by which he had erroneously said, Note, page 33, vol. i. 'he had earned his reward' of a place and pension.

"This story, therefore, of Durham's treachery and reward I still believe to be a falshood, without even the shadow of foundation; but I do not believe it to have been deliberately *fabricated* by the author. It is such a falshood, as, I am sorry to say, occurs too frequently in the writings of men who enter with great warmth into any important controversy, whether theological, political, or philosophical. Ruminating on the facts, and the inferences which they draw from them, till they become heated with their subject; and viewing every thing through the medium of party prejudice, they come at last to confound their inferences with the facts from which they are supposed to flow; and deceive themselves, before they attempt to deceive others. Of this frailty incident to human nature, there are numberless instances in Mr. Laing's History and Dissertation, in which, in my review, I have taken no notice.

"In page 633, vol. 25, of the 'British Critic,' I have said, 'that it is in the highest degree *incredible* that Lethington's wife was so ready a writer, that she *could copy all* the letters in one night; and that Mr. Laing's confused appeal to *Murdin* and the *State Trials*, for the truth of this extraordinary fact, will not have much weight with those who have attended to his mode of quotation;' and these assertions I now repeat. 'But this anonymous writer (says Mr. Laing) *did not consult*, and *had never seen*, either *Murdin* or the State Trials.'

"Is Mr. Laing quite certain of these FACTS? The State Trials indeed I had not consulted; and finding no mention, in *Murdin*, of the *time* in which Lethington's wife is said to have copied the letters, I thought it not impossible that Mr. Laing, through inadvertency or too great eagerness in the cause of his clients, might have introduced that circumstance, which renders *the tale utterly incredible*. I did not, however, advance my *conjecture* to the dignity of *fact*; and as a believer in the innocence of the unfortunate Queen, I am now glad to find, on consulting the State Trials, that my conjecture was ill-founded. Barram, the Queen of England's Serjeant, does say *, 'that Ledington accompanied the Earl of Moray only to understand his secrets, and to betray him; and that Ledington stole away the letters, and kept them ONE NIGHT, and caused his wife to write them out. Howbeit the same were

* "State Trials, vol. i. 92."

but

but *copies translated out of French into Scotch*, which, when Ledington's wife had written out, he caused them to be sent to the Scottish Queen.'

"Whether Mr. Laing's appeal to this story be confused or not, the reader will judge for himself; but I am under no apprehension of being contradicted by any reader of impartiality, when I repeat what I said before, that the story itself serves to strengthen the evidence produced by Whitaker, that, in 1571, neither the Queen of Scots nor the Bishop of Ross had seen even *copies* of the letters. The testimony of Queen Elizabeth's Sergeant cannot give credibility to what, from the nature of things, is in the highest degree incredible; and when it states such things as notorious *facts*, it gives no small support to the plausible conjecture of Whitaker, that the confession of Leslie, as we have it in Murdin and the State Trials, has been 'altered by the interpolating hand of Cecil.'

"The third and last passage of the review to which Mr. Laing objects, he has quoted fairly in the 517th page of your Magazine; but in replying to it in the next page, he has thought fit to interpolate my words. I have no where said that instead of *Murdin* I consulted Leslie's *Defence of Mary's Honour* in order to find that particular assertion, which, in the passage objected to, I have called very extraordinary. I call it extraordinary still; indeed one of the most extraordinary assertions that I have any where met with, except that, of which some notice is taken in the 636th page of the same review; and that I do not speak at random, your readers will be convinced by the following extract from the paper to which Mr. Laing refers:—

"'I talked (says Leslie) with the Duke (of Norfolk) allane in a gallery, whair he uttered to me he bare gud-will to the Quene my mistresse; and that he had talked with Therle of *Murry* and *Lithington* at *Leith*, and had sene the lettres which they had to produce aganes the Quene my mistresse and other defences, wherby there wold such mater be proven aganes her, that wold dishonor her for ever; and yf it wer anes publist the Quene's Majesty of *Ingland* wold get counsell be such as luffed not my mistresse, to publishe the same to the worlde, and to send ambassadoris to all other *Christane* Princes, to mak the same knowen to them, that they could mak no furder sutte for her delyverye; and perhaps grytar rigour micht enshew to her persoune; therefore he advysed me to confer with *Lithingtoun*, and yet betwix him and me, we might find sum meenes to stay the rigour intendit; and promissed what he could do to yat effect be Lithington's advertisement he would do it. I *replyed** that *Lithingtoun* wold have her to ratifie the dismission made at *York* for a tyme, for he affermed that could hurt her no more now, beinge keped prisoner in *Ingland*, nor that which was done in *Lythlewin*, for so shuld she stay the uttering of any meteris agains her, and within six monethis she wold be restored to her cuntrey with honor, and so micht revoke all done be her. To this the Duke answered, what yf that war alone to be *quitte of the present infamie and slander*, and let tyme work the rest.'

"Such is the passage to which Mr. Laing appeals for the truth of his assertion that Leslie 'tacitly *acknowledged* the authenticity of the letters,

* "Not *proposed*, as Mr. Laing affirms in his Dissertation."

and

and *proposed* a device of Lethington's that the Queen should ratify her former resignation of her crown!' But I say now, as I said before, that it 'contains nothing which the most perverse ingenuity can construe into such an *acknowledgment*,' or such a *proposal* by Leslie; whilst the other passage which I *quoted* from that illustrious Prelate, shews the extreme improbability of his having *ever* made such a proposal as that which is here made by Lethington, and approved by the Duke of Norfolk. It is apparent from the whole conversation between the Duke of Norfolk and the Bishop of Ross, as it is reported in the 53d page of Murdin's Collection, that they had then met confidentially for the *first time*; that the conferences at York were *not then regularly opened*; that it was at *Leith* and *not* at *York*, that the Duke had *talked with Murray and Lethington, and seen the letters*; and that as Leslie had neither seen them nor been made acquainted with their contents, he could not, as an honest man, admit their authenticity, nor as a man of common sense attempt to persuade the Duke that 'they were entirely a forgery.' He listened, however, to the proposal of Lethington and Norfolk, *not* because he thought, as Mr. Laing more than insinuates, his beloved mistress guilty, but *because* the proposal was *represented to him* as necessary to prevent her from being *calumniated at foreign Courts*; to *avert the greater rigour intended against her person*; and to *open the way for her restoration to her country with honour*.

"Such are the specimens which Mr. Laing has chosen to give of a review, 'filled (as he says) throughout with the most calumnious insinuations against his character and credit as an historian; such,' as he expressed himself in his private correspondence with Mr. Nares, 'are the insults, public and deliberate insults, which I have offered to his character; and such is the *malignant* and *scurrilous* tenor of the whole review.' This, no doubt, is the more provoking that *he*, good man, far from offering any *insult* to the characters of Whitaker, Stuart and Tytler, or treating any one of them with *malignant scurrility*, expresses his dissent from the opinions with peculiar *modesty*, and *candidly allows to each the merit* which he possessed!!! It is true, that he has accused them *all* of *scurrilously perverting every historical fact*; and has said of Whitaker, that he has written *absurdly*, *ridiculously*, and with *artifice*; of Stuart, that he was influenced not by the love of truth, but by *personal resentment to Robertson*; and of Tytler, that he *concealed the truth*, *understood not the controversy*, and wrote as *a lawyer pleads from his brief!* But Mr. Laing has, perhaps, a licence for all this; whilst a writer in the 'British Critic,' who may find himself involved with his friends in the general charge of having scurrilously perverted every historical fact *, cannot retort the charge without being guilty of the most unpardonable offence!

"Mr.

---

* "It appears that Mr. Laing has turned over the volumes of the Encyclopædia Britannica. It is therefore somewhat difficult to conceive, how he could fail to discover, in 1797, that *I wrote the Biographical Sketch of Mary Queen of Scots*, which is published in that work. He assures us, however, that he never heard of me till May 1800, though he lived much

in

"Mr. Laing proceeds to detect and state, as he says, my former malignity in other journals, and begins his statement with giving a very garbled and unfair account of a matter which has no concern whatever with the review of his, or any other work; which he has grossly misrepresented in his correspondence with Mr. Nares, and of which, that I may deprive him for ever of this engine of mischief, I beg leave, through the channel of your Magazine, to submit to the public the following authentic detail.

"I am, indeed, the author of the Letter, which, under the signature of 'Gregor Mac Nab,' was published in the Monthly Magazine for July (not August) 1709; and it is likewise true that, without subscribing it, I adopted the apology for that letter which was published in the Magazine for May 1800. It is, however, so far from being true that my motives for writing the first of these papers, were such as Mr. Laing has been pleased to represent them in his correspondence with Mr. Nares, that I shall never cease to think them, what they have been thought by others, motives of humanity. The case was briefly as follows:

"Mr. Plenderleath, 'the recruit, whom,' as Mr. Laing truly observes, 'an officer (the commander) of the Clan-Alpin regiment of Fencibles, had refused to dismiss at my request,' was the son of a gentleman, whom I had the pleasure, while he lived, to call my friend. He had himself been an officer in the line; but, becoming dissipated, had disposed of his commission. Reduced to extremity, and his father having died in embarrassed circumstances, he had, in London, enlisted as a common soldier in the Clan-Alpin regiment then raising, of which the head-quarters were at Stirling. His widowed mother, who had not heard of him for many months, was in an agony of distress on his account; doubtful whether he was alive or dead, till by one of my family, to whom he had been known from his infancy, he was accidentally met in the street of Stirling. In the mean time some friends, whom in his better days he had made for himself, had procured for him a commission in the New Romney Regiment of Fencible Cavalry; and that regiment he was required, while in Stirling, to join by a certain day.

"These circumssances, which can be proved by the most incontrovertible evidence, I stated to the commander of the Clan-Alpin regiment, painting in as striking colours as I could the distress of Mrs. Plenderleath, who had been in Stirling to see her long-lost son; and when I concluded with begging the young man off, I was indeed surprized at the terms in which my petition was rejected. That surprize was aggravated and combined with indignation, when soon afterwards I learned, that Mr. Plenderleath, who had gone to visit his mother, and to equip himself for rejoining his regiment, which, if my memory does not deceive me, was then stationed in Ireland, had been brought back to Stirling as a *deserter*,

---

in Edinburgh, where the Encyclopædia was carrying on, and attracted some notice! He has, indeed, been singularly unlucky in hearing nothing of *recent* events. He had heard nothing of the revival of the Clan Mac-Gregor in 1793!!!"

and

and threatened as such with punishment *. I had a short time before read the history of the Clan *Mac-Gregor*, published in the first volume of the work entitled, *The Revenge of Scotland*: and the curious information which I had received there operating on the indignation which I now felt, prompted me to write and send to the publisher of the Monthly Magazine, the Letter subscribed 'GREGOR MAC NAB.'

"It is not, however, true, as Mr. Laing alleges, that when challenged as the author, I 'at first denied all knowledge of *the libel*, with solemn protestations of my innocence, and of my inviolable respect for the clan and name of Mac-Gregor.' The circumstances of the denial were as follow:

"The letter subscribed 'Gregor Mac Nab,' was sent from Stirling about the middle of May, 1799, and contained, at the end of it, a short note to the publisher of the Magazine, requesting him to lay the manuscript before a mutual friend—a man of letters, who would aid him in forming a decision on the propriety of publishing it: and, if it should be approved, give him the writer's name. Becoming soon sensible that the satire was too keen and comprehensive to be sanctioned by the provocation which I had received, and afraid that it might tend to excite mutiny in the regiment, I wrote to that friend himself to get back from the publisher of the Magazine the Letter subscribed '*Gregor Mac Nab.*' That Letter did not appear either in the Magazine for May, or in that for June; and when, after an intervention of more than two months from the time that I had countermanded the publication, I received from Sir John Mac-Gregor Murray a letter, dated August the 20th, asking me whether I was the author of a Letter, replete with *scurrility*, which had appeared in *some* London Magazine, against the Officers of the Clan-Alpin regiment, but which he declared he had not seen, I felt myself authorized to say that I was *not*. The Letter subscribed 'Gregor Mac Nab,'

---

* "I must request it to be understood, that I mean not to throw the slightest blame on the actual conduct of the Commander of the regiment. He assured me that he could not, without the authority of the Commander in Chief, dismiss a recruit; though another Officer had assured me, that he could not keep as a common soldier, a man who had the commission of Cornet in another regiment. Taking it for granted that the judgment of the Colonel was most to be depended on, and dreading the consequence to Mr. Plenderleath, should he be compelled, whilst a commissioned officer in one regiment, to undergo an inspection as a common recruit in another not yet embodied, I assisted him in drawing up a memorial on his case to the late Sir Ralph Abercromby, then Commander in Chief of the Forces in Scotland. The memorial was presented to that amiable and gallant Officer on the day before the Clan-Alpin recruits were inspected and embodied in a regiment; the young man was treated by him with great kindness and compassion, and by his direction dismissed from the regiment.—He then joined the regiment of cavalry in which he was an officer; when it was reduced, he went to Bengal, where he obtained a commission in the third regiment of Native Cavalry; and in the late war with Holkar fell in battle, fighting gallantly for his King and Country."

though

though replete with pointed ridicule, contains, I apprehend, no *scurrility*; and I could not, at any rate, entertain a doubt but that the Letter written by *me* had been suppressed in consequence of my positive injunction; whilst I knew that others had threatened to publish something about the Clan-Alpin regiment of a very different purport.

"These facts were proved by the most incontrovertible evidence, to the entire conviction of Sir John Mac.Gregor Murray himself; and to him, as well as to Lord Woodhouselee, Mr. William Erskine, Advocate, nd Mr. Macfarquhar, Writer to the Signet, I appeal for the truth of every one of them.

"The offensive Letter, however, having been published, notwithstanding the means which I had taken, as I thought, successfully, to suppress it*, I beg leave to ask any man of candour what line of conduct remained for me to pursue, different from that which I actually pursued? Mr. Laing is mistaken when he supposes, for he cannot have been told, that the manuscript was produced against me in a *Court of Justice*. I received, indeed, a summons; but no action was carried on against me, because I acknowledged my offence, and by my Counsel—now Lord Woodhouselee—offered to make for it any apology that Sir John Mac-Gregor Murray, who conceived himself injured, should dictate. Perhaps Mr. Laing thinks that it would have been more honourable, and more consistent with morality, to persist in attempting to justify a satirical effusion, which, though prompted at first by what I felt as virtuous indignation, I had long been sensible was on many accounts wrong. If so, I thank God that his notions and mine, as well of honour and morality, as of some other things, are very different. I am a man, and subject to the failings of humanity; I am a Christian, and when I err, I wish to repent of my errors and to atone for them; if Mr. Laing imagine that he has never erred, as I have no wish to atone for his errors, I do not envy his self-complacency.

"But the apology, or, as Mr. Laing calls it, the recantation, was humiliating! I admit that it was more humiliating than generosity, perhaps, on the one hand, would have demanded, or than pride, on the other, would willingly have granted; but when the party which conceived itself injured had given a solemn promise, that no man should be made acquainted with the *name* of the apologist, except the friend to

---

* "I must here acquit my friend, as well as the publisher of the Magazine, of all blame, which those not acquainted with the particulars of the case may be inclined to put upon them. My friend was absent from London, and did not receive my letter till it was too late to get back the manuscript; and I have been assured, that by a combination of very singular circumstances, which would have misled any man, the publisher was induced to believe, that 'Gregor Mac Nab' was no fictitious signature. He should, however, have shewn the manuscript, as soon as he received it, to the gentleman to whom he was directed to shew it, by the short note at the bottom of the page; but even for that negligence I am acquainted with his apology, and admit its validity."

whose

whose care the apology was to be transmitted *, would there have been honour, virtue, religion, or common sense, in going to law about the *terms* of my apology, when I was myself sensible that some apology was due? Let me declare too, and I do it solemnly in the presence of him who knows the secrets of all hearts, that, as this is the only instance produced by Mr. Laing of any thing published by me, for which an apology was made, so I believe it to be the only thing that I ever published, for which *candour would say that an apology could reasonably be required* †. What he calls the libel, for which, he says, that I was prosecuted *at the same time*, may be seen, with my name subscribed to it, in the Edinburgh Magazine for August 1799; and I have not the smallest hesitation to stake my character upon the verdict that might be pronounced on it, by any British Jury which should be made acquainted with all the circumstances of the case.

"Such are my errors, venial I trust in the eyes of God and man; such the proofs which Mr. Laing has thought fit to lay before the public, of the malignity of one with whom he never had the slightest personal acquaintance; and such the means by which he hopes to effect the ruin of my character, and expose me to the world as a *self-convicted libeller!* Yet these errors and this malignity affect not the review of his Dissertation, which must stand or fall by its own merit. If the objections to his statements and reasonings be well-founded, they ought to carry conviction to every candid mind, even though they had been drawn up by *the Father of Lies himself;* and if they be frivolous and ill-founded, they could not injure the Dissertation or its author, though they had been urged *by the Apostle St. John.*

"Mr. Laing says, that I have *quarrelled* with the Anti-Jacobin. This is perfectly new to me. Though I have not for some time contributed any thing to that Journal, I have never ceased to respect its Editor as a

---

* "Sir John Mac-Gregor Murray gave the promise, and, as he is a man of honour, I have not a doubt but he has religiously observed it. Nay, I am persuaded, by all that I know or have heard of him, that he will be more indignant, as he certainly has cause to be, at Mr. Laing's conduct on the present occasion, than even I am. I feel it therefore a duty which I owe to him, to declare thus publicly, that Mr. Laing, as he informed the Archdeacon of Strafford, derived his information from no man of the name of Mac-Gregor: and that he afterwards confessed that, with respect to some particulars, he had misunderstood his informer."

† "By the manner in which Mr. Laing expresses himself of the Letter subscribed 'Gregor Mac Nab,' the reader may be led to suppose it a libel of the blackest kind against the whole Clan of Mac-Gregor; I acknowledge it to have been exceedingly improper; but I hope that no man will form his opinion of it, either from Mr. Laing's representation, or from the apology that was demanded for it, without carefully reading the Letter itself; for I can assure the public, that it gave not the slightest offence to the family, which is here generally considered to be at the head of the Clan, or interrupted, for one moment, the intimacy which for nineteen years has subsisted between that family and me."

man highly accomplished, and of sound principles; and I have not heard that he has ceased to profess some regard for me. I am not, however, so well known to him as to the Editors of the British Critic; and, if Mr. Laing's desire *to promote the circulation of the Anti-Jacobin* have induced him to transmit to the Editor of it, the same series of calumnies which he sent to those Editors, as proofs that I AM UTTERLY DISQUALIFIED FOR THE OFFICE OF A REVIEWER, he *may* have produced the quarrel which he mentions. I confess, however, that it appears to me probable that he may have failed to accomplish his object in the one case, as completely as in the other. Whether in *attempting* to accomplish such an object by such means, there be not a deeper tincture of malevolence in proportion to the ill intended, and therefore a more immoral act on the part of Mr. Laing, than in any thing which even *he* has laid to my charge, let the impartial public, before which he has brought the question, judge. To its tribunal he has appealed, and of that tribunal I dread not the decision. Meanwhile, to convince Mr. Laing that I bear to him no ill-will, I beg leave, as I know that he delights in the study of what is ancient, to recommend as a fit subject for his meditation the following truth, which is as valuable now as it was two thousand years ago:

Κακουργότερον οὐδὲν διαβολῆς ἐστί πω· λαθρὰ γὰρ ἀπατήσασα τὸν πεπεισμένον, μῖσος ἀναπλάττει πρὸς τὸν οὐδὲν αἴτιον.

I am, Sir, &c.

Stirling, July 10, 1806. GEORGE GLEIG.

We have already observed, that the *quarrel*, so confidently stated by Mr. Laing, existed no where but in the fertile imagination of that gentleman. But it would be an ill return for the protection and encouragement which we have experienced from the Public, were we to conclude this article without declaring, most unequivocally, that this *Review* never has been, and never shall be, prostituted to the base purposes of private animosity and personal abuse. Such false accusations, however, by whom ever preferred, shall never deter us from a strict and conscientious discharge of our duty, whether called upon to bestow commendation on talents, knowledge, and integrity, or to chastise ignorance, calumny, and perversion.

PRIVATE TRIBUTES TO PUBLIC CHARACTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

SIR,

SEVERAL letters have appeared in the daily papers, inquiring into the appropriation of the money subscribed, on various late occasions, to erect statues, columns, pillars, or monuments, for perpetuating the memory or achievements of favourite public characters. The expectations of the subscribers, and of the public, having not yet been gratified with the sight of any one of these memorials, the delay has been commented upon in terms of much asperity; and has sometimes illiberally been imputed to interested motives on the part of the Gentlemen into whose hands the

the subscriptions were paid. But far different has been the real cause of the disappointments in question, as I shall endeavour to explain, by giving a short history of each of these projects, which, with the observations arising out of the subject, may, I flatter myself, prove neither uninteresting nor unentertaining to your readers.

The first modern undertaking of this kind was the subscription for a statue to Mr. PITT. A large sum of money was raised, but the statue was not; and, after much discussion, the subscribers resolved, at a general meeting, to place the whole of the contributions in the public funds. This singular decision gave rise to many conjectures. Some construed their thus employing them in buying up part of the national debt, into a delicate compliment to that favourite measure of the Premier—the Sinking Fund. Others imagined that the subscribers deposited their money in the 3 per Cent. Consols, from the persuasion that Mr. Pitt considered that mighty work, raised under his auspices to its present colossal height, as a sufficient memorial to his own fame, and which he might bequeath to an admiring posterity, with the exulting exclamation of Horace:—

"Exegi monumentum ære perennius,
Regulique situ pyramidum altius!"

Others again thought that they were glad to get rid of the money in any manner, in order to put an end to the admirable, but poignant raillery exercised on this projected statue, by the wits of the Opposition. From which of these motives they acted, or whether from any of them, the public will probably never know, unless some Gentleman on the Committee should kindly favour them with the explanation.

The next emotion of gratitude which displayed itself in this line was after our repeated naval victories in the late war. A subscription was then entered into, for the purpose of raising a naval pillar, or column, to record to after ages the memory of the gallant heroes by whom they have been achieved. This proposal was received with enthusiasm; the subscription filled, but we yet look in vain for the naval pillar. Great differences of opinion, it seems, prevailed as to the situation in which it ought to be placed. Some recommended Greenwich Park, where the disabled veterans, in that honourable retirement which the gratitude of their country has provided for them, might view this noble memorial of the triumphs in which they had shared, and retrace the loved image of the commanders under whom they had fought and bled. Others thought it would be more advantageously placed on Portsdown Hill, where the sight of it would animate our gallant tars engaged in active service, to emulate the deeds which it recorded. Others wished it to be placed in St. James's Park, where they would have the best opportunity of viewing it themselves. The plan of the pillar was unfortunately liable to as much controversy as the situation of it. At one period the quadrangular form would have been happily adapted to the commemoration of the four signal victories which had then so recently graced the British naval annals.—Subsequent achievements broke in upon this plan, and whether an hexagon, an octagon, or any other form, be now resolved on, while the war continues the risque will still remain, either of its having too few sides to dedicate to new exploits which may claim a place there, or more than we may gain victories to fill. One gentleman endeavoured to obviate this

difficulty by a very ingenious suggestion. He proposed having niches on each side, up to the very top of the column, in which statues of all our most meritorious commanders might be placed, as we see those of kings, saints, and martyrs, ranged one above another in our ancient Gothic structures. But it presently appeared that the Committee would never agree in the choice of the candidates to fill these niches; and thus this naval pillar has turned out to be nothing more than a bone of contention. When Mr. Alexander Davison, the treasurer, was first immured in the King's Bench prison, considerable apprehensions prevailed amongst the subscribers for the safety of their money; but they soon had the happiness of hearing, that this gentleman was not confined there as a defaulter in any pecuniary engagements, but for some other practices, which, if, in the execution of this plan a niche should ever be reserved to commemorate his public services, he probably will not be ambitious of having recorded in the inscription. They have since had the farther satisfaction of learning, that from this durance vile for a breach of the laws of his country, he has been called into a high confidential situation by the present Administration, who so justly claim, and so happily combine, all the rank, *virtues*, and talents of the empire.

Another subscription was set on foot after the battle of Trafalgar, for raising a monument, or triumphal arch, to the memory of the late illustrious Lord NELSON: but the Committee have very sagaciously baffled all attempts to criticise their proceedings, by taking no one step, that has ever yet been heard of, towards carrying the plan into execution.

Though first in order in point of time, I have reserved till last, the subscription raised by the friends of Mr. Fox, that I might contrast the principle acted upon on that occasion, with the proceedings in the instances I have already mentioned. The manly and comprehensive mind of that gentleman, despised the silly vanity of pompous sculpture and lying inscriptions. He wisely preferred solid pudding to empty praise, and instead of a statue or a monument to be erected to his memory after his decease, he converted the subscription raised by his admirers into a snug annuity for his use while living.

I most heartily coincide in the superior propriety of this appropriation, and rejoice, for the honour of my country, that none of the other plans have ever been carried into effect; but that, on the contrary, the hand of Providence seems to have ordained, that, like their grand prototype the Tower of Babel, as they began in folly they should end in confusion. This stricture will not, I trust, be thought too severe, when the consequences to which these projects lead are properly considered. Every public character has his circle of admirers; and if Mr. Pitt's statue should be set up by his friends, we may expect, from the spirit of competition and party, soon to see it confronted by that of Mr. Fox, as we had formerly seen them in person confronting each other in the House of Commons; and posterity would be as much puzzled to reconcile to truth the inscriptions on their respective pedestals, written by their respective partizans, as we sometimes have been to reconcile to each other their sentiments and speeches on great political questions. The rage for statue-making by private subscription, if the fashion should be once established, may be carried so far, by contemptible vanity, or misplaced adulation, that the grizzled wigs and sapient faces of half our Deputies and Com-

mon

mon Councilmen may be cut out in stone at the expence of their admiring brethren, and be set up in Guildhall to stare at the immortal Lord Chatham, or the powers of the sculptor may be employed in commemorating the wisdom and energy of Lord Sidmouth's Administration, and in erecting a trophy to that *chef d'œuvre* of political sagacity, by which his Lordship so *happily* and *permanently* restored *the blessings* of peace to his Country—the Treaty of Amiens.

But to conclude with a more serious reflection. Laudable as the intentions of the subscribers to these undertakings undoubtedly are, the principle of them is erroneous. Statues and monuments to public characters, who have rendered eminent services to their country, should be raised by great public bodies, or by the nation at large; but illustrious men are degraded, and their glories are shorn of half their beams, when the memorials of them become objects of private and partial subscriptions. The true solution of all the delays which have appeared so extraordinary to the public is, that *the impropriety of these projects has defeated every attempt to carry them into execution.* New difficulties present themselves at every step; and I know of no mode by which the subscribers can extricate the Committees who conduct these designs, from the dilemma in which they are involved, but by candidly acknowledging that in a moment of patriotic enthusiasm their feelings gained the ascendancy over their judgment, and by appropriating the whole of these monies to the Patriotic Fund, the Naval Asylum, or some other charitable institution connected with the public service. May these observations contribute to this result; and may the bounty of individuals no longer be misplaced in ostentatious offerings at the shrine of great men, who are raised above its reach, but be confined to the relief of humble woe. Thus directed, it acts within its proper sphere, becomes a source of consolation to suffering humanity, and the blessing of heaven will reward its exercise.

ARCESILAS.

INQUIRY RESPECTING THE UNPUBLISHED WRITINGS OF BISHOP HORNE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

SIR,

THE ever-to-be lamented death of the "Catholic" Jones, deprived the true sons of the Church of England of much valuable instruction from his own pen, and also from that of his amiable friend and patron Bishop Horne. As the biographer of that excellent prelate, he announced his intention to the public of publishing "some MSS. Sermons, and other Pieces in Divinity, written by Dr. Horne, on the same size and type with the Sermons. Life, &c.*."—but death prevented the execution of the design.

* See the advertisement postfixed to the 2d edition of Bishop Horne's "Apology," &c.

What these manuscripts are, we are not directly informed. From "Jones's Life of Bishop Horne," we collect, that he had composed, in his younger years, a course of sermons on the Eleventh Chapter of the Hebrews. These he was scrupulous of publishing, because "they wanted to be reviewed with a more critical eye;" and, at the time of his death, he had bestowed upon three alone, what he judged to be a due portion of the "*limæ labor.*"—"I have the copy" (adds his worthy biographer), "and hope it will be published. Whoever looks at them, will wish he had lived to satisfy his mind about all the rest;"—and so truly must every friend to the cause of rational piety, hope and wish likewise. Neither could it prove any reasonable detraction from the established character of their author, that the world should be gratified, even by the *unfinished* compositions of Bishop Horne. *Here* the voice of candour must plead, and criticism be disarmed.

Upon the Letters of Bishop Horne, his biographer thus expresses himself in his Preface to the Life:

"While we speak of those writings which are known to the public, you and I cannot forget his readiness and excellence in writing letters, in which employment he always took delight from his earliest youth, and never failed to entertain or instruct his correspondents. His mind had so much to communicate, and his words were so natural and lively, that I rank some of his letters among the most valuable productions of the kind. I have, therefore, reason to rejoice, that amidst all my interruptions and removals, I have preserved more than an hundred of them; in reviewing of which, I find many observations on subjects of religion, learning, politics, manners, &c. which are equally instructive and entertaining; and would certainly be so esteemed if they were communicated to the world, at least to the better part of it; for there were very few occurrences, or transactions of any importance, either in the church, or the state, or the literary world, that escaped his observation, and in several of them he took an active part. But in familiar letters, not intended for the public eye (as none of his ever were), and suggested by the incidents of the time, some of them trivial and domestic, there will be of course many passages of less dignity than will entitle them to publication; yet, upon the whole, I am satisfied that a very useful selection might be made out of them; and I will not despair of making it myself at some future opportunity."

The few extracts with which we are gratified in the "Life," convinces us of the truth of these remarks; only upon the "passages of less dignity," I would observe, there are many who would peruse with rapture the *most familiar* notices of Bishop Horne, even although they should not be ushered into the world by a preface from the pen of Hayley.

I have been led to trouble you with these remarks, by observing the republication of the "Considerations on the Life and Death of St. John Baptist," upon which there is this only drawback, that it is *not* on the same size and type with the Bishop's other works;" and surely the fragments of the writings of this most amiable man ought not to be lost. It is to be hoped the schismatical spirit of the times has not so far disunited sound piety and sound taste, as to render the writings of Bishop Horne likely to be neglected. By the real children of our apostolical establishment

ment they will, certainly, never cease to be prized; for (once more to uss the words of the excellent Jones), "they will make good subjects, good Churchmen, and good Christians."

Should these hints meet *their* eye, into whose hands the unpublished MSS. of the late Bishop Horne have fallen, let them at least know that there are those who would receive any production of *his* pen with pleasure and gratitude: and who hope one day to be thus gratified. To forward this is my object, in presuming to request the favour of the appearance of these hints in the Miscellaneous department of the Anti-Jacobin Review, for I know of no better method of giving them publicity amongst the members of the Church of England. By admitting them, therefore, you will greatly oblige, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

AN ADMIRER OF THE WRITINGS OF BISHOP HORNE.

September 1, 1806.

We heartily concur with our Correspondent, in expressing a fervent wish that the public may speedily be gratified with any Sermons, or Letters, hitherto unpublished, of that most amiable man, and most exemplary Prelate, Bishop Horne; convinced, as we are, that nothing could come from his pen, which would not tend to instruct the minds, and to meliorate the hearts, of his readers. Possibly the MSS. to which the Bishop's most excellent biographer referred in his Life of that Prelate, may be in the hands, either of the son of Mr. Jones, or of his confidential friend, Mr. Stevens. Wherever they may be, we hope they will not remain much longer unpublished. We concur also with our Correspondent, in lamenting the too-prevalent practice of publishing the works of the same author in a different size and type. It destroys the uniformity of a library, and has no one advantage to recommend it. For our part, we wish to see a new, complete, and uniform edition of Bishop Horne's Works, including all his unpublished Manuscripts, with that masterly piece of biography, his Life, by the late Mr. Jones, of Nayland, who was admirably qualified for the task, as his conduct illustrated the piety and the virtues which his pen recorded. Certain we are, that an adequate subscription might speedily be raised for defraying the expence of such an edition.

ON THE DIMINUTION OF THE NUMBER OF CLERICAL STUDENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

SIR,

HAVING with pleasure observed your unwearied and ardent zeal for the preservation of our happy Constitution, both in Church and State, from the commencement of your literary labours to this day, I trust you will not reject the feeble effort of an old man, to draw the attention of those in power towards a circumstance, which, as far as I can recollect,

has not as yet been taken any public notice of, and that, if my information be correct, you will give it your support. The circumstance to which I allude, is the *diminution* of the Clergy of the Church of England.

You, Sir, know full well the many degrading and vexatious oppressions which have within these few years been heaped, with no unsparing hand, on their defenceless heads, and that they have been endured almost without a murmur. But though they, remembering whose servants they are, and under whose banner they have enlisted, may not return evil for evil, but contrariwise blessing, it does not therefore follow that their children should engage in the like arduous duties, or enter into a profession which, with the utmost economy has not, and in very many instances does not, afford a decent competency.—"No!" may a father say to his sons, "though I trust you will never forget those divine lessons, which it has been my duty and my pride to inculcate on your minds, yet are you not bound to enter the same thorny path that your parent has trod, or endure the insults and reviling of your fellow-men, who, it is most probable, will grudge you, as they have me, the very bread which you eat; engage in the service of your country in some other line; or employ the pittance I can give you in trade; *that*, with common industry, will procure you a far better and more comfortable maintenance than there is any likelihood you can obtain from the church *."

And now, Sir, permit me to hope, that you will inquire (for you *can* make the inquiry), whether the reports which have come to my ears are, or are not, founded on fact, viz. "That the number of young men brought up to the Church at our Universities, has been for several years gradually diminishing; that the candidates for holy orders are not nearly so many as they have formerly been; that the country affords very few instances of youths who are intended for the sacred functions, excepting the children of noblemen or gentlemen who have livings in their own gift; and that, in the metropolis itself, it is with the utmost difficulty assistance can be procured for an officiating Clergyman who happens to be indisposed?"

If the result of your inquiries should confirm these statements, I need not point out to you the very serious consequences which must speedily ensue. The axiom, which we have all been taught from our childhood, *that the Church and State must stand or fall together*, has not, I believe,

---

* In confirmation of this idea, I remember hearing the Bishop of Peterborough (Hinchcliffe) say, in the House of Lords some years ago (when the great debate was about a different mode of provision for the Clergy), "Though a man may have the purity of an angel, and the eloquence of a Cicero, they will avail him little whilst tithes stand in his way."—The voice and manner in which this was delivered, made a most powerful impression on the whole House; but the reply of the Chancellor (Thurlow) "That the freehold of the Clergy was anterior to that of their Lordships (whose most ancient tenure was derived from the Crown since the Conquest), and consequently was not to be invaded without the utmost peril of their own interests," quashed a plan, to which the generality of the Clergy, at that time, appeared to wish success.

been

been ever controverted; and surely, then, it highly concerns our rulers to prevent, if it be possible, by every means in their power, the tremendous overthrow.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

September 14, 1806. SENEX.

NICHOLSON's SHORT-HAND, AND THE CRITICAL REVIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

SIR,

IT is a pleasing reflection, that while the most flagrant injustice is committing by a few, the majority are ever ready to aid the injured. It is in the latter class that I have ranked the Conductor of the Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine, and request the insertion of the following remarks on some strictures on my method of Short-hand, which appeared in the Critical Review for July last.

The Reviewer sets out with comparing all professors of stenography to quacks, who obtain patents for coffins, water-proof cloth, razors, &c. where each proprietor claims a decided superiority over others, adding, that "Mr. Nicholson, in order to recommend his plan, has puffed himself off at the expence of former claimants;" charging me, moreover, with having by this method of depreciation endeavoured to supersede Dr. Mavor's popular work. In what part of my book such puffing appears, remains yet undiscovered, and I trust always will. It has been often asserted, that there can be no judgment in works of art without comparison. In comparing my plan with Dr. Mavor's, I have done no more than others of my predecessors in the same walk. Any other respectable System would have answered this purpose—Dr. Mavor's was taken on the supposition of being the most popular. The Reviewer says, that the way I have proposed of deciding the merit of Short-hand systems, is not just, "the question is, can the method proposed teach others the art of writing short-hand in less time, or with greater dispatch?" Without declaring that both these objects are answered, which I leave to the decision of the public, who are the altimate and most impartial arbitrators, I answer, that as the whole of my System is comprised in a single duodecimo page, it cannot be very complex; and, as by a comparison which I have given, it appears that in writing the Lord's Prayer I have occasion to employ twenty-three movements of the pen less than Dr. Mavor, the dullest school-boy could understand that the fewer strokes he has to make for each letter or word, the more expeditiously can he write. The Reviewer next asserts, that I have studied brevity too much. On what ground this charge rests, will appear from the comparison before mentioned, in which I employ eight more letters: for instance, instead of shortening the word *father* to *fthr*, I have written *fathr*; instead of *nm* for *name*, I have written *nam*, &c. nay, I have professed that "I do not contend for such abbreviations as *hd* for *hallowed*; *km* for *kingdom*, as they form too short a method of writing to be easily read; if I had adopted such a practice my specimens would have had a more lineal appearance, but they would have lost much in legibility."—Stenography, p. 8.

The

The Reviewer goes on to say, that "stenography, like common writing, must be taught, first by accurately delineating the characters, then by joining the vowels to the consonants, and the consonants to the vowels. All rules and examples of this nature are, however, utterly disregarded by Mr. Nicholson." That this representation is totally unfounded, will appear from the slightest inspection into the work. No less than nine plates are appropriated to the joining of letters into words, which are formed by attaching vowels to consonants, consonants to vowels, and consonants to consonants. Upwards of a page is occupied by *general rules*, and 22 pages by examples of joinings, interspersed in the letter-press, among remarks and *particular rules* under each letter in the alphabet.

The Reviewer complains at the price of 4s. for fifty-six pages, but he should have taken twelve engravings into the account. He adds, that "Dr. Mavor has, indeed, the conscience to demand a guinea for his performance." In justice to Dr. Mavor, the price of his work is no more than 7s. 6d. in boards. The Reviewer recommends Prosser's Shorthand, which sells at 4s. as being cheaper than either. When the Editor of a Critical Review employs a person who betrays the grossest ignorance, not only of the art of which the book he censures treats of, but even of the books which have been written on the subject, submitting to the most bare-faced misrepresentations, what dependence can be placed on such a literary journal? It surely behoves the Conductor of that Review to be more cautious in admitting contributions.

Poughnill, near Ludlow,
Sept. 20, 1806.

GEORGE NICHOLSON.

POETRY.

ODE TO THE ARMY.

INTREPID warriors, round whose brows
Conquest her wreath entwines,
Torn from th' embattled lines
Of armies venturing to oppose,
To you the gathered triumphs flow
Of all the victories of the foe.

Where'er ye press your deathless deeds,
Extend, secure Britannia's sway;
Wave her broad ensigns o'er the meads
Of rising or of setting day.

Ye here, in martial order set,
With kindred aids begirt,
Your native rights assert,
Contemptuous of the furious threat;

Eager

Eager the boastful palm-crown'd foe
A check to conquest's pride should know.
But far from your opposing strand,
The fury-guided warriors see,
Rush where attending armies stand,
Where Europe struggles to be free.

O! may a Briton's ardour warm
These champions of their right,
His soul their acts excite,
His calmness 'mid the battle's storm!
Victory her banners wave on high,
The baffled foe bewilder'd fly!
As late on MAIDA's glorious field,
Where Britons press'd in strict array,
With fatal power the weapon wield,
And fix the fortune of the day.

As o'er the plains of Ind' your course
Is urg'd 'mid tropic heat,
Where myriads vainly meet,
And bend to your resistless force;
Let Afric's sands your honours shape,
From Alexandria to the Cape:
From Naples hear victorious cries,
And answering shouts from Plata's strand.
O! rush to other triumphs! rise
To new Trafalgars of the land!

GRAY's ELEGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

SIR,

I WAS perusing last night in your valuable and interesting Review for April, a translation of Gray's Elegy into Latin verse, which seemed to possess considerable merit, when we consider the age of the translators. As the "Epitaph" was not given, permit me to send it to you in a Roman dress; and believe that I cannot flatter myself that it has any other claim to be admitted into the Miscellaneous Part of the Anti-Jacobin, than that the author is also, Sir,

Your admirer and constant reader,

Sept. 22. ADOLESCENS.

EPITAPHIUM.

Cespite sub veredi, placidâ nunc morte quiescens,
Ignotus juvenis hec sua membra jacet.
Annuit haud mæsto divina scientia partu,
Compellat juvenem, sed dolor ipse suum.

Largus

Largus et ingenuus, divos non multa poposcit,
Blandes at precibus nulla repulsa fuit.
Cum miseris fletu ingemuit (nihil amplius illi),
Messus et ex cœlo dulcis amicus adest.

Virtutes fugias, quæso, tentare latentes,
Nec peccata notes singula quœque sua.
Sedibus horrendis (ubi spe tremefacta quiescunt),
Numinis in gremio condita namque jacent.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

NEVER, surely, did modern times present to the contemplative mind such a chaos, as the political world, both foreign and domestic, now exhibits to the inquisitive politician! Whether we cast our eyes upon the public stage, abroad or at home, we find such matter for concern and astonishment, as almost to preclude the use of our discriminating faculties, and as to make us turn, with disgust, from the objects which press upon our notice on every side. Abroad, we see nothing but doubt usurping the place of decision; want of foresight, absence of judgment, treachery, cowardice, and neglect of those common precautions, which the paramount principle of self-preservation so imperatively prescribes. At home, self-interest usurping the seat of patriotism, dereliction of principle, flagrant inconsistency, bare-faced corruption in those who are the loudest advocates of primitive purity; liberty in profession, and tyranny in practice; reproaches of apostacy, from men who are themselves the only apostates; shameless attempts to amalgamate, in the state-crucible, heterogeneous particles; unprincipled efforts to crush independence, by the very advocates of freedom; activity, where passiveness would be laudable; and sloth, where energy is a duty; in short, such a scene opens on our view, as the true friend of his country—not of the *name*, but of the *thing*—must revolt from with mingled emotions of indignation and horror.

It was utterly impossible for the human imagination to conceive, that the King of Prussia, who had staked his all—his throne—his political existence, upon the present contest, should not have looked upon a *defeat* as a *possible contingency*, in engaging in a war with such an enemy as he had to encounter; or, that he should have neglected to adopt those precautionary measures to which every able general has recourse, in calculating the chances of war, and which are essential to prevent the possibility of rendering *defeat* and *destruction* one and the same thing. Yet such omission, and such neglect, have the Prussian Councils manifested to astonished Europe. That the battle of Auerstadt was nobly contested by the Prussians—that the Sovereign and most of his Generals displayed the most determined courage, far be it from us to deny; but that the necessary measures for securing a safe retreat, and for establishing a rallying point,

in

in case of a defeat, were not adopted, is, unhappily, but too evident. —It is perfectly clear, from a careful attention to all the accounts which have been received, that the loss of the French, on that dreadful day, was immense; and it is equally manifest, that had the Prussian troops emulated the zeal and spirit of their commanders—had they done their duty, in short, the day had been their own, and the Tyrant of Europe had experienced an effectual check to his destructive career.—But the accursed spirit of French intrigue had corrupted too many of the troops, who, belying the high character which their nation had acquired for military prowess, basely deserted their standards, and consigned their chiefs an easy prey to their enemies. It is by such arts—by fraud, perfidy, and corruption, and not by talents, conduct, or courage, that the low-born Upstart, who now insolently lords it o'er the lawful Sovereigns of Europe, has succeeded in the accomplishment of all his nefarious plans of ambition, subversion, ruin, and death. Where such treachery prevails, successful resistance is impracticable. The dispersion of the Prussian army, after the battle, the separation of its different divisions from each other, the neglect to repair to any given point, all combine to prove, at once, the nature and extent of the defeat, and the absence of all wisdom and foresight in the formation of the plan of the campaign. Gross impolicy and imprudence, indeed, were displayed *before* the battle. The King of Prussia had it in his power to bring the French to action before their whole force was concentrated, or even assembled. Having suffered this opportunity to escape, it was natural to suppose that he intended to wait the arrival of the Russians, before he would risk an action; but, by an unaccountable resolution, which nothing but success could justify, he pursued neither of these courses, and fought *too late*, or *too soon*. The consequences of this misconduct are deplorable; are they beyond the hope of a remedy? This is a question on which it would be presumption to speak with any thing like decision. So often has the soundest reasoning been baffled; so often have arguments, founded on experience and on the known motives and rules of human conduct, been confuted by events; so often has the strongest and the most acute political foresight been deceived in its predictions, during the progress of the French Revolution, that we are little disposed to argue from the past to the future, or to indulge in any conjectures on the probable termination of the present alarming state of public affairs.

As there is nothing which so forcibly impresses any moral or political lesson on the human mind, as personal experience of those dangers, and of those evils which it teaches to appreciate and to avert, we may conclude that the late disasters which the King of Prussia has sustained, and the humiliating condition to which he is reduced, have been productive of their proper effect, in convincing him that they are solely to be ascribed to the folly and imprudence of his own conduct during the French Revolution. Had he but acted last year, as he has acted this year, France had been humbled, and he had been hailed as the Political Saviour of Europe. A worse fate than Austria then experienced, chiefly through his pusillanimity, is now his lot—with the additional mortification of knowing that his fate is considered, by all reflecting minds, as a memorable example of retributive justice, while it excites no pity, nor, were it not for its consequences

sequences to the general cause, would it create a wish for revenge. Such is our feeling on the subject, that we long ago declared that we would illuminate our Office on the entrance of the French into Berlin; and, had we not been apprehensive that the *cause* of our joy would have been subject to misconception, and that it might be supposed to proceed from the triumph of France, and not from the humiliation of Prussia, her oldest and most useful ally, we certainly should have fulfilled our intentions.

In the absence of all intelligence from the Continent of Europe, it would be folly to speculate on the relative state, or situation of the Contending Powers; and equally so to infer what they *will do*, from what they *have done*. It may not, however, be improper to remind the public, that there still remains ample means for punishing the barbarous invader, and for destroying his murderous hordes. The Russians, though we know nothing of their movements, must certainly, ere this, have effected a junction with that part of the Prussian army, which directed its flight towards Poland; and, though they may not yet be in sufficient force to oppose the concentrated body of French, now posted on the Prussian territory, still they will suffice to maintain their ground, till sufficiently reinforced for that purpose. From the active engagement of the Russians in the war, another inestimable advantage will accrue; no single battle can now decide its fate; the means of retreat are secure; and every retrograde movement would only bring them nearer to fresh armies, on their march to join them, by whose junction they would be enabled again to advance, with increased strength, to renew the contest. It is a farther consolation to know, that the Russian army is, perhaps, the only army on the Continent, which the Murderer of Jaffa, and the ministering demons which surround him, cannot *corrupt*. Still then, gloomy as the prospect is, Europe *may be* saved—no thanks, however, are due, for this *possibility*, to the Prussian Monarch, who, as we predicted, dispatched his lacquey, Lucchesini, to sue for peace, which, fortunately for Europe, the Tyrant haughtily refused. PEACE, at such a crisis, would be the death warrant of European independence; while war continues there will be ground for hope; but PEACE WILL BE THE HERALD OF DESPAIR! It must not be forgotten, too, in appreciating the present state of affairs, that the forces of Austria, and of Sweden, still remain unbroken; while Great Britain is *able* to afford a powerful co-operation. But, alas! woeful experience has taught us, that it is not the *existence*, but the *use* and *application* of a military force, in other words, the *will* to employ, and the *wisdom* to direct it, that can rescue the civilized world from barbarism and oppression. Buonaparte is certainly in a more dangerous situation than his temerity has yet placed him in, since his cowardly flight from the sandy plains of Egypt. He is no longer on the Banks of the Rhine, where reinforcements could easily, and without interruption, march to his assistance. He is at a great distance from his land of slaves; the country behind him is filled with Princes and with people smarting under his lash—with the exception of a few mushroom *Princelings* of his own creation, who are at once detested and despised by their miserable subjects; the gallant bands of Austria hang on his rear, and the Swedes on his flank, while the Russians and Prussians press upon him in front. Any union of action among these Powers would infallibly crush the Tyrant.

But

But, though the most potent motives combine to prescribe such an union, we are not rash enough to assert even the probability of its formation.—Where self-interest and self-preservation have so repeatedly failed to produce their *natural* effects, who can venture to hope for the adoption of a line of conduct more consistent with sound policy, and more favourable to the general safety?

At home, the bustle of *electioneering* seems not only to have engrossed the attention, but absolutely to have absorbed the faculties, of the people; the spirit of patriotism has, through it, been subdued by the spirit of party; in promoting the interests of a favourite candidate, the interests of the country have been neglected; and in deciding the fate of a county or a borough, the fate of Europe has been forgot. Ministers, themselves, appear to have joined in the general oblivion of care and of business, during the prevalence of the septennial saturnalia; the President of the Board of Controul consigned the concerns of India to subordinate hands, while he attended in person to the concerns of Southwark; the Secretary for the War Department left his favourite commander (the able panegyrist of Mack!) to inhale the sea breezes at Falmouth, and the military expeditions, and all the business of the war department to shift for themselves, while he was *patriotically* employed in marshalling the friends of government in Norfolk; and others of his associates condescended, with equal zeal, to abandon for a while the affairs of their respective departments, in order to secure the *independence* of Hampshire.—More illustrious characters have joined in the national festivity; and political tours have been made, for the same laudable purpose, of confirming the rights of electors *to dispose* of their votes at their pleasure, and of ensuring, by that means, the inestimable blessing of a *free representation*, and the inappreciable advantage of a *pure*, *unbiassed*, and *upright* Parliament. To be serious—the events of this election require a distinct, particular, and comprehensive discussion.—They involve questions of great constitutional importance; and, if we mistake not, some of them will become the subjects of Parliamentary interference. This discussion, therefore, must be reserved for a future day.

We promised, on the appointment of the present Administration, to judge them by their *measures*; but, on these (we mean such of them as relate to grand objects of foreign policy), though nine months have elapsed, we have not yet had any opportunity for the exercise of our judgment. Ministers, however, though tardily, have acted wisely, in sending Lord Hutchinson to the head-quarters of the Combined Armies; though, if his Lordship and Colonel Crawford had changed situations, the arrangement would have appeared more wise and more consistent, in the opinion of the nation at large. Lord Morpeth, indeed, had been previously sent as Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Berlin; but this young Nobleman seems to have been struck with the same panic which affected the flying Prussians, and to have secured his retreat with the velocity of an extraordinary courier. It is of the first consequence, that Ministers should secure a safe and ready channel for the conveyance of information from the Continent; as their co-operation with the Belligerent Powers must be influenced by circumstances, it is absolutely necessary that they should be early apprised of the movements, and relative situation of the contending armies.

T has.

That a favourable diversion *may be* made, is our fervent wish; that *it might be* made, on more points than one, is most certain; that it *will be* made is, we fear, *doubtful.*

November 21.

P. S.—Since the above Summary was written, accounts have been received of the destruction of the Prussian army, and of the annihilation of the Prussian Monarchy!!! That work of subjugation, which ancient Rome, in its zenith, took years to accomplish, modern France completes in a month! It is impossible to account for *such* events, without the *interposition of Providence.*

November 25.

This Work having fallen into new hands, will henceforth be conducted with more spirit than it has lately displayed; but still, on the same principles, religious and political; a consistent adherence to which, amidst the tergiversation and apostacy of the present times, must entitle it to public respect, and to public protection. A greater number of publications will be reviewed, and a greater variety of matter introduced. To the Appendix to the *Twenty-fifth* Volume, which will appear on the 1st of February, 1807, an Historical Sketch of Europe, including a View of the Politics of the different Powers, during the four preceding months, together with observations on the proceedings of the last Parliament, will be prefixed. And, henceforth, a similar sketch will be given with each volume. These brief HISTORIES OF THE TIMES will be written with perspicuity, spirit, and impartiality. The writers will be attached to no party; and will distribute their praises and their censures, according to the merits or demerits of those on whom they will be bestowed, and not according to the party to which they may belong. They boldly assert their independence, and mean, by their conduct, to prove the justice of their claim.

The Booksellers, as well as our Readers and Correspondents, are informed, that the ANTI-JACOBIN OFFICE *will be immediately* REMOVED to No. 20, *Wych-street, Drury-Lane*, to which place all *Letters, Advertisements,* and *Communications to the Editor,* must, henceforth, be addressed.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Valerius Publicola to the Right Hon. John Sullivan, is received and shall appear in our next.

Observator is informed, that the facts mentioned in his Letter, on the Murder of the Rev. Mr. Parker, are of too serious a nature to be inserted on *anonymous* authority. If he will send his name (privately) to the Editor, and authenticate the facts, his Letter shall certainly appear.

Printed by B. M'Millan,
Bow-Street, Covent-Garden.